

# A Partial Order Reduction Technique for Event-driven Multi-threaded Programs

Pallavi Maiya

Indian Institute of Science

Rahul Gupta

Indian Institute of Science

Aditya Kanade

Indian Institute of Science

Rupak Majumdar

MPI-SWS

## Abstract

Event-driven multi-threaded programming is fast becoming a preferred style of developing efficient and responsive applications. In this concurrency model, multiple threads execute concurrently, communicating through shared objects as well as by posting asynchronous events that are executed in their order of arrival. In this work, we consider partial order reduction (POR) for event-driven multi-threaded programs. The existing POR techniques treat event queues associated with threads as shared objects and thereby, re-order every pair of events handled on the same thread even if re-ordering them does not lead to different states. We do not treat event queues as shared objects and propose a new POR technique based on a novel backtracking set called the dependence-covering set. Events handled by the same thread are reordered by our POR technique only if necessary. We prove that exploring dependence-covering sets suffices to detect all deadlock cycles and assertion violations defined over local variables. To evaluate effectiveness of our POR scheme, we have implemented a dynamic algorithm to compute dependence-covering sets. On execution traces obtained from a few Android applications, we demonstrate that our technique explores many fewer transitions—often orders of magnitude fewer—compared to exploration based on persistent sets, wherein, event queues are considered as shared objects.

## 1. Introduction and Overview

Event-driven multi-threaded programming is fast becoming a preferred style of structuring concurrent computations in many domains. In this model, multiple threads execute concurrently, and each thread may be associated with an event queue. Threads may post events to each other's event queues, and a thread can post an event to its own event queue. For each thread with an event queue, an event-loop processes the events from its event queue in the order of their arrival. The event-loop runs the handler of an event only after the previous handler finishes execution but interleaved with the execution of all the other threads. Further, threads can communicate through shared objects; even event handlers executing on the same thread may share objects. Event-driven multi-threaded programming is a staple of developing efficient and responsive smartphone applications [17]; a similar programming model is also used in distributed message-passing applications, high-performance servers, and many other settings.

Stateless model checking [9] is an approach to explore the reachable state space of concurrent programs by exploring different interleavings systematically but without storing visited states. In




Figure 1: A partial trace of an event-driven multi-threaded program

practice, the success of stateless model checking depends crucially on partial order reduction (POR) techniques [4, 8, 20, 26]. Stateless search with POR defines an equivalence class on interleavings, and explores only a representative interleaving from each equivalence class (called a Mazurkiewicz trace [16]), but still provides certain formal guarantees w.r.t. exploration of the complete but possibly much larger state space. Motivated by the success of model checkers based on various POR strategies [1, 2, 10, 11, 19, 21, 22, 29], in this work, we propose an effective POR strategy for event-driven multi-threaded programs.

**Motivation.** We first show why existing POR techniques may not be very effective in the combined model of threads and events. Consider a partial execution trace of an event-driven multi-threaded program shown in Figure 1. The operations are executed from top to bottom. The operations in the trace are labeled  $r_1$  to  $r_5$  and those belonging to the same event handler are enclosed within a box labeled with the corresponding event. An operation  $\text{post}(t, e, t')$  executed by a thread  $t$  enqueues an event  $e$  to the event queue of a thread  $t'$ . In our trace, threads  $t_2$  and  $t_3$  respectively post events  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  to thread  $t_1$ . The handler for  $e_1$  posts an event  $e_3$  to  $t_1$ . The handlers for  $e_2$  and  $e_3$  respectively write to shared variables  $y$  and  $x$ .

Figure 2 shows the state space reachable through all valid permutations of operations in the trace in Figure 1. Each node indicates a state of the program. An edge is labeled with an operation and indicates the state transition due to that operation. The interleaving corresponding to the trace in Figure 1 is highlighted with bold lines and shaded states. For illustration purposes, we explicitly show the contents of the event queue of thread  $t_1$  at some states. Events in a queue are ordered from left to right and a box containing  $\perp$  in-




Figure 2: A transition system depicting the state space reachable through all valid permutations of operations in the trace in Figure 1

indicates the rear end of the queue. Pictorially, an event is removed from the queue when it is dequeued for handling.

Existing POR techniques (e.g. [1, 6, 8, 22, 24]) recognize that  $r_2$  and  $r_5$  (also  $r_1$  and  $r_4$ ) are independent (or non-interfering) and that it is sufficient to explore any one of them at state  $s_6$  (respectively,  $s_{10}$ ). The dashed edges indicate the unexplored transitions. However, existing POR-based model checkers will explore all other states and transitions. Since no two handlers executed on  $\tau_1$  modify a common object, all the interleavings reach the same state  $s_5$ . Thus, the existing techniques explore two redundant interleavings. This happens because these techniques treat *event queues as shared objects* and so, mark any two post operations that enqueue events to the event queue of the same thread as dependent. Consequently, they explore both  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  at state  $s_0$ , and  $r_2$  and  $r_3$  at state  $s_1$ . These result in unnecessary reorderings of events.

More generally, if there are  $n$  events posted to an event queue, these techniques may explore  $O(n!)$  permutations among them, even if exploring only one of them may be sufficient. Therefore, a POR technique that can avoid redundant event orderings can be significantly more scalable. We exploit this observation. For the state space in Figure 2, our approach explores only the initial trace (the leftmost interleaving) and thus visits substantially fewer states and transitions compared to existing techniques.

**Our approach.** To realize the reduction outlined above, we do *not* consider event queues as shared objects. Equivalently, we treat a pair of posts even to the same thread as *independent*. The main question then is “How to determine which events to reorder and how to reorder them selectively?”. Surely, if two handlers executing on the same thread contain dependent transitions then we should reorder their post operations, but this is not enough. To see this, consider a partial trace  $w$  shown in Figure 3. The transitions  $r_3$  and  $r_6$  belong to two different threads and are dependent as they write to the same variable. Figure 4 shows a transition system depicting a partial state space explored by different orderings of  $r_3$  and  $r_6$ . The contents of thread  $\tau_1$ ’s queue are shown next to each state. As can be seen in the rightmost interleaving, executing  $r_6$  before  $r_3$  requires posting  $e_2$  *before*  $e_1$  even though their handlers do not have dependent transitions. A state space exploration starting with sequence  $w$  has to reorder  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  so as to explore a different ordering of  $r_3$  and  $r_6$  than that explored by  $w$ . Thus, operations posting events to the same thread may have to be reordered even to reorder some multi-threaded dependences! Our first contribution is to define a dependence relation that captures both single-threaded as well as multi-threaded dependences.

We now discuss the implications of treating posts as independent and only selectively reordering them. For multi-threaded programs, or when posts are considered dependent, reordering a pair of adjacent independent transitions in a transition sequence does not affect the reachable state. Hence, the existing dependence relation [8] induces equivalence classes where transition sequences differing only in the order of executing independent transitions are in the same Mazurkiewicz trace [16]. However, our new dependence relation (where posts are considered independent) may not induce Mazurkiewicz traces on an event-driven multi-threaded program. One reason is that reordering posts to the same thread affects the order of execution of the corresponding handlers. If the handlers contain dependent transitions, it affects the reachable state. Second, one cannot rule out the possibility of *new* transitions (not present in the given transition sequence) being pulled in when independent posts are reordered, which is not admissible in a Mazurkiewicz trace. We elaborate on this in Section 2.3.

Our second contribution is to define a novel notion of *dependence-covering sequence* to provide the necessary theoretical foundation to reason about reordering posts selectively. Intuitively, a transition sequence  $u$  is a dependence-covering sequence of a transition sequence  $w'$  if the relative ordering of all the pairs of dependent transitions in  $w'$  is preserved in  $u$ . While this sounds similar to the property of any pair of transition sequences in the same Mazurkiewicz trace, the constraints imposed on a dependence-covering sequence are more relaxed (as will be formalized in Definition 2.4), making it suitable to achieve better reductions. For instance,  $u$  is permitted to have *new* transitions, that is, transitions that are not in  $w'$ , under certain conditions.

Given a notion of POR, a model checking algorithm such as DPOR [6] uses persistent sets [8] to structure the state space exploration to only explore representative transition sequences from each Mazurkiewicz trace. As we show now, DPOR based on persistent sets is unsound when used in conjunction with the dependence relation in which posts are independent. Let us revisit the transition system in Figure 4. The set  $\{r_1\}$  is persistent at state  $s_0$ , because exploring any transition other than  $r_1$  from  $s_0$  does not hit a transition dependent with  $r_1$ . This set is tagged as PS in Figure 4. A selective exploration using this set explores only one ordering between  $r_3$  and  $r_6$ .

Our third contribution is the notion of *dependence-covering sets* as an alternative to persistent sets. A set of transitions  $L$  at a state  $s$  is said to be dependence-covering (formalized in Definition 2.5) if a dependence-covering sequence  $u$  starting with some transition in  $L$  can be explored for any sequence  $w'$  executed from  $s$ . We prove that selective state-space exploration based on dependence-covering sets is sufficient to detect all deadlock cycles and violations of assertions over local variables. The dependence-covering sets at certain states are marked in Figure 4 as DCS. In contrast to PS, DCS at state  $s_0$  contains *both*  $r_1$  and  $r_2$ . The set  $\{r_1, r_2\}$  at  $s_0$  is a dependence-covering set because for any transition sequence  $w'$  starting from  $s_0$ , there exists a dependence-covering sequence  $u$  starting with a transition in  $\{r_1, r_2\}$ . Let  $w'$  be the transition sequence along the rightmost interleaving in Figure 4. The sequence  $w$  (the leftmost interleaving) is not a dependence-covering sequence of  $w'$  since the dependent transitions  $r_3$  and  $r_6$  appear in a different order. We therefore require  $r_2$  to be explored at  $s_0$ . Note that,  $\{r_2\}$  is another dependence-covering set at  $s_0$  as both the orderings of dependent transitions  $r_3$  and  $r_6$  can be explored from  $s_{10}$  reached on exploring  $r_2$ .

Our final contribution is a dynamic algorithm called EM-DPOR to compute dependence-covering sets. EM refers to the Event-driven Multi-threaded concurrency model. EM-DPOR follows the DFS based exploration strategy of DPOR [6] but the key steps of our algorithm are different. In particular, EM-DPOR incorporates




Figure 3: A partial trace  $w$  of an event-driven multi-threaded program involving a multi-threaded dependence

several non-trivial steps (1) to reason about both multi-threaded dependences as well as dependent transitions from different event handlers on the same thread (single threaded dependences), and (2) to identify events for selective reordering and infer appropriate backtracking choices to achieve the reordering. We prove that EM-DPOR computes dependence-covering sets.

We now briefly explain how EM-DPOR computes the dependence-covering sets and explores the state space shown in Figure 4 starting with sequence  $w$ . On exploring a prefix of sequence  $w$  and reaching state  $s_5$ , EM-DPOR identifies  $r_6$  to be dependent with  $r_3$ . When attempting to compute backtracking choices at state  $s_2$  (the state where  $r_3$  is explored) to reorder  $r_3$  and  $r_6$ , EM-DPOR finds  $r_4$  to have a happens-before ordering with  $r_6$ . However,  $r_4$  is not enabled at  $s_2$  because both  $r_3$  and  $r_4$  execute on the same thread  $\tau_1$  and  $r_4$  is a transition of the handler of  $e_2$  while  $e_1$  is at the front of the queue (see the event queue shown at  $s_2$ ). Because EM-DPOR is aware of the event-driven semantics and knows that  $r_3$  and  $r_4$  come from handlers of two different events  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ , it attempts to reorder the events themselves. We call this a step to *reschedule pending events* because  $e_2$  is pending in the queue of  $\tau_1$  at  $s_2$ . EM-DPOR then starts *another* backward search to identify the backtracking choices that can reorder  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ . It identifies that the corresponding post operations  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  can be reordered to do so. It therefore adds  $r_2$  to the backtracking set at  $s_0$  ( $r_1$  is already there since we start with  $w$ ), exploring which leads to  $s_8$  where  $e_2$  *precedes*  $e_1$  in the event queue as required. EM-DPOR then reaches state  $s_{10}$  where  $r_3$  and  $r_6$  are *co-enabled*. Being dependent, EM-DPOR explores both. Note that even while considering only  $r_3$  and  $r_6$  from different threads as dependent, EM-DPOR is able to identify posts at  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  for reordering.

**Experiments.** We have implemented a proof-of-concept model checking framework called EM-Explorer which simulates the non-deterministic behaviour exhibited by Android applications given individual execution traces. We implemented EM-DPOR which performs a selective state-space exploration based on dependence-covering sets in EM-Explorer. For comparison, we also implemented an exploration based on DPOR, where posts to the same thread are considered dependent. We performed experiments on traces obtained from 5 Android applications. Our results demonstrate that our POR explores many fewer transitions—often orders of magnitude fewer—compared to DPOR using persistent sets.

**Related work.** Mazurkiewicz traces form the foundation for most existing work on POR, and most prior work in the event-driven setting considers event queues as shared objects. For example, Sen and Agha [22] and Tasharofi et al. [24] describe dynamic POR techniques for distributed programs with actor semantics where processes (actors) communicate only by asynchronous message passing. Both techniques explore all possible interleavings of messages sent to the same process. In comparison, we explore only a subset of event orderings at each thread, and doing so requires relaxing Mazurkiewicz traces to dependence-covering sequences. Recent al-




Figure 4: A transition system for some valid permutations of operations in the trace in Figure 3

gorithms explore optimality in POR [1, 21]. Establishing optimality in our setting is an interesting future work but extending optimality arguments to dependence-covering sequences seems non-trivial.

Reduction techniques and model checking algorithms for MPI programs are described in [19, 25]. MPI programs too use message-passing constructs like non-blocking send and receive to exchange data between processes, and use global synchronization constructs like barriers. However, the message (event) processing semantics of MPI programs and event-driven programs are different and thus, the reduction techniques are not directly applicable in our setting.

Asynchronous programs with a multiset semantics have been considered in [5, 7, 23].  $R^4$  [13] is a stateless model checker for event-driven applications like client-side web applications.  $R^4$  adapts persistent sets and DPOR algorithm to the domain of single-threaded, event-driven programs with multiset semantics. Each event handler is atomically executed to completion without interference from other handlers, and thus an entire event handler is considered a single transition. In contrast, our work focuses on POR techniques for multi-threaded programs with event queues, and thus needs to be sensitive to interference from other threads while reordering dependent transitions.

In many domains, the event-loop works in FIFO order, as is also considered in this work. For example, Android [12, 14], TinyOS<sup>1</sup>, and Java AWT<sup>2</sup>, provide a default FIFO semantics. Abstracting FIFO order by the multiset semantics can lead to false positives. There is a lot of recent work on concurrency analysis for smartphone environments. For example, [3, 12, 14] provide algorithms for race detection for Android applications. Our work continues this line by describing a general POR technique. We do note that the event dispatch semantics can be diverse in general. For example, Android applications permit posting an event with a timeout or posting a specific event to the front of the queue. We over-approximate the effect of posting with timeout by forking a new thread which does the post non-deterministically but do not address other variants in this work. We leave a more general POR approach that allows such variants to event dispatch to future work.

<sup>1</sup><http://www.tinyos.net>

<sup>2</sup><http://docs.oracle.com/javase/7/docs/api/java/awt/EventQueue.html>

## 2. Formalization

We now formalize our notion of partial order reduction for event-driven multi-threaded programs. Some of the definitions below follow the conventions in [6].

### 2.1 Transition System

We consider an event-driven multi-threaded *program*  $A$  which has the usual sequential and multi-threaded operations such as assignments, conditionals, synchronization through locks and thread creation. In addition, the operation  $\text{post}(t_1, e, t_2)$  posts an asynchronous event  $e$  from the source thread  $t_1$  to (the event queue of) a destination thread  $t_2$ . Each event has a handler, which runs to completion on its thread but may interleave with operations from other threads. An operation is *visible* if it accesses an object shared between at least two threads or two event handlers (possibly running on the same thread). All other operations are *invisible*. We omit the formal syntax and semantics; they can be found in [14].

The *local state of an event handler* is a valuation of the stack and the variables or heap objects that are modified only within the handler. The local state of a thread is the local state of the currently executing handler. If a handler running on a thread has finished executing, but the thread has not started executing the next handler (if any), we say that the thread is *idle*; the local state of an idle thread is undefined. A *global state* of the program  $A$  is a valuation to the variables and heap objects that are accessed by multiple threads or multiple handlers. Even though event queues are shared objects, we do not consider them in the global state (as defined above). Instead, we define a *queue state of a thread* as an ordered sequence of events that have been posted to its event queue but are yet to be handled. This separation allows us to analyze asynchronous posts more precisely. Event queues are FIFO queues with unbounded capacity, that is, a  $\text{post}$  operation never blocks. For simplicity, we assume that each thread is associated with an event queue. If a thread does not have an event queue in reality then its state is determined by the default procedure that runs on it in response to some initial event and no other events are enqueued to its event queue subsequently.

Let  $L$ ,  $G$  and  $Q$  be the set of all local states, global states and queue states respectively. Let  $T$  be the set of all threads in  $A$ . Then, a *state*  $s$  of an event-driven multi-threaded program  $A$  is a triple  $(l, g, q)$  where (1)  $l$  is a partial map from  $T$  to  $L$ , (2)  $g$  is a global state and (3)  $q$  is a total map from  $T$  to  $Q$ . A *transition* by a thread  $t$  updates the state of  $A$  by performing one visible operation followed by a finite sequence of invisible operations ending just before the next visible operation; all of which are executed on  $t$ . We identify a transition by its visible operation, e.g., we say “ $\text{post}$  operation” to mean a transition whose first operation is a  $\text{post}$ . Let  $R$  be the set of all transitions in  $A$ . A transition  $r_{t,\ell}$  of a thread  $t$  at its local state  $\ell$  is a partial function,  $r_{t,\ell} : G \times Q \mapsto L \times G \times Q$ . A transition  $r_{t,\ell} \in R$  is enabled at a state  $s = (l, g, q)$  if  $\ell = l(t)$  and  $r_{t,\ell}(g, q)$  is defined. We may use  $r_{t,\ell}(s)$  to denote application of a transition  $r_{t,\ell}$ , instead of the more precise use  $r_{t,\ell}(g, q)$ . The first transition of the handler of an event  $e$  enqueued to a thread  $t$  is *enabled* at a state  $s$ , if  $e$  is at the front of  $t$ 's queue at  $s$  and  $t$  is idle in  $s$ . We assume that if a transition is defined for a state then it deterministically maps the state to a successor state.

We formalize the state space of  $A$  as a *transition system*  $\mathcal{S}_G = (\mathcal{S}, s_{\text{init}}, \Delta)$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the set of all states,  $s_{\text{init}} \in \mathcal{S}$  is the initial state, and  $\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$  is the transition relation such that  $(s, s') \in \Delta$  iff  $\exists r \in R$  and  $s' = r(s)$ . We also use  $s \in \mathcal{S}_G$  instead of  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Two transitions  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  may be *co-enabled* if there may exist some state  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  where they both are enabled. Two events  $e$  and  $e'$  handled on the same thread  $t$  may be *reordered* if there exist states  $s, s' \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $s = (l, g, q)$ ,  $s' = (l', g', q')$ ,

$q(t) = e \cdot w \cdot e' \cdot w'$  and  $q'(t) = e' \cdot v \cdot e \cdot v'$ . In Figure 2, events  $e1$  and  $e2$  may be reordered but not  $e1$  and  $e3$ .

For simplicity, we assume that all threads and events in  $A$  have unique IDs. We also assume that the transition system is *finite* and *acyclic*. This is a standard assumption for stateless model checking [6]. The transition system  $\mathcal{S}_G$  collapses invisible operations and is thus already reduced when compared to the transition system in which even invisible operations are considered as separate transitions. A transition system of this form is sufficient for detecting deadlocks and assertion violations [9].

**Notation.** Let  $\text{next}(s, t)$  give the next transition of a thread  $t$  in a state  $s$ . Let  $\text{thread}(r)$  return the thread executing a transition  $r$ . If  $r$  executes in the handler of an event  $e$  on thread  $t$  then the *task* of  $r$  is  $\text{task}(r) = (t, e)$ . A transition  $r$  on a thread  $t$  is *blocked* at a state  $s$  if  $r = \text{next}(s, t)$  and  $r$  is not enabled in  $s$ . We assume that only visible operations may block. Function  $\text{nextTrans}(s)$  gives the set of next transitions of all threads at state  $s$ . For a transition sequence  $w : r_1.r_2 \dots r_n$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ , let  $\text{dom}(w) = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Functions  $\text{getBegin}(w, e)$  and  $\text{getEnd}(w, e)$  respectively return the indices of the first and the last transitions of an event  $e$ 's handler in  $w$ , provided they belong to  $w$ . For a transition  $r$ ,  $\text{index}(w, r)$  gives the position of  $r$  in  $w$ .

**Deadlock cycles and assertion violations.** A pair  $\langle DC, \rho \rangle$  in a state  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  is said to form a *deadlock cycle* if  $DC \subseteq \text{nextTrans}(s)$  is a set of  $n$  transitions blocked in  $s$ , and  $\rho$  is a one-to-one map from  $[1, n]$  to  $DC$  such that each  $\rho(i) \in DC$ ,  $i \in [1, n]$ , is blocked by some transition on a thread  $t_{i+1} = \text{thread}(\rho(i+1))$  and may be enabled only by a transition on  $t_{i+1}$ , and the transition  $\rho(n) \in DC$  is blocked and may be enabled by two different transitions of thread  $t_1 = \text{thread}(\rho(1))$ . A state  $s$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  is a *deadlock state* if all threads are blocked in  $s$  due to a deadlock cycle.

An *assertion*  $\alpha$  is a predicate over local variables of a handler and is considered visible. A state  $s$  *violates* an assertion  $\alpha$  if  $\alpha$  is enabled at  $s$  and evaluates to *false*.

### 2.2 Dependence Relation

The notion of dependence between transitions is well-understood for multi-threaded programs. It extends naturally to event-driven programs if event queues are considered as shared objects, thereby, marking two posts to the same thread as dependent. To enable more reductions, we define an alternative notion in which two post operations to the same thread are *not* considered dependent. One reason to selectively reorder events posted to a thread is if their handlers contain dependent transitions. This requires a new notion of dependence between transitions of event handlers executing on the same thread, which we refer to as *single-threaded dependence*.

In order to explicate single-threaded dependences, we first define an event-parallel transition system which over-approximates the transition system  $\mathcal{S}_G$ . The *event-parallel transition system*  $\mathcal{P}_G$  of a program  $A$  is a triple  $(\mathcal{S}_P, s_{\text{init}}, \Delta_P)$ . In contrast to the transition system  $\mathcal{S}_G = (\mathcal{S}, s_{\text{init}}, \Delta)$  of Section 2.1 where events are dispatched in their order of arrival and execute till completion, a thread with an event queue in  $\mathcal{P}_G$  removes any event in its queue and spawns a fresh thread to execute its handler. This enables concurrent execution of events posted to the same thread. Rest of the semantics remains the same. Let  $T$  and  $T_P$  be the sets of all threads in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  and  $\mathcal{P}_G$  respectively. For each state  $(l, g, q) \in \mathcal{S}$ , there exists a state  $(l', g', q') \in \mathcal{S}_P$  such that (1) for each thread  $t \in T$ , if  $l(t)$  is defined then there exists a thread  $t' \in T_P$  where  $l'(t') = l(t)$ , (2)  $g = g'$ , and (3) for each thread  $t \in T$ ,  $q(t) = q'(t)$ . Let  $R_P$  be the set of transitions in  $\mathcal{P}_G$  and  $ep : R \rightarrow R_P$  be a total function which maps a transition  $r_{t,\ell} \in R$  to an equivalent transition  $r'_{t',\ell'}$  such that  $\ell = \ell'$  and either  $t' = t$  or  $t'$  is a fresh thread spawned by  $t$  in  $\mathcal{P}_G$  to handle the event to whose handler  $r_{t,\ell}$  belongs in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ .




Figure 6: Partial event-parallel transition system for the program in Figure 5.

We illustrate the event-parallel transition system for the example program in Figure 5. Here,  $x$  and  $y$  are shared variables. The transitions  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  respectively run on threads  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ . The last three lines in Figure 5 give definitions of handlers of the events  $e_1$ ,  $e_2$  and  $e_3$  respectively. Figure 6 shows a partial state space of the program in Figure 5 according to the event-parallel transition system semantics. The edges are labeled with the respective transitions. The shaded states and thick edges indicate part of the state space that is reachable in the transition system semantics of Section 2.1 as well, under the mapping between states and transitions described above.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $R_P$  be the set of transitions in the event-parallel transition system  $\mathcal{P}_G$  of a program  $A$ . Let  $D_P \subseteq R_P \times R_P$  be a binary, reflexive and symmetric relation. The relation  $D_P$  is a valid **event-parallel dependence relation** iff for all  $(r_1, r_2) \in R_P \times R_P$ ,  $(r_1, r_2) \notin D_P$  implies that the following conditions hold for all states  $s \in \mathcal{S}_P$ :

1. If  $r_1$  is enabled in  $s$  and  $s' = r_1(s)$  then  $r_2$  is enabled in  $s$  iff it is enabled in  $s'$ .
2. If  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  are both enabled in  $s$  then there exists  $s' = (l', g', q') = r_1(r_2(s))$  and  $s'' = (l'', g'', q'') = r_2(r_1(s))$  such that  $l' = l''$  and  $g' = g''$ .

This definition is similar to the definition of dependence relation in [9] except that we do *not* require equality of the event states  $q'$  and  $q''$  in the second condition above. Clearly, any pair of **post** transitions, even if posting to the same event queue, are *independent* according to the event-parallel dependence relation.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $R$  be the set of transitions in the transition system  $\mathcal{S}_G$  of a program  $A$ . Let  $D_P$  be a valid event-parallel dependence relation for  $A$  and  $D \subseteq R \times R$  be a binary, reflexive and symmetric relation. The relation  $D$  is a valid **dependence relation** iff for all  $(r_1, r_2) \in R \times R$ ,  $(r_1, r_2) \notin D$  implies that the following conditions hold:

1. If  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  are transitions of handlers of two different events  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  executing on the *same thread* then the following conditions hold:
  - (A) Events  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  may be reordered in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ .
  - (B)  $ep(r_1)$  and  $ep(r_2)$  are independent in  $D_P$ , i.e.,  $(ep(r_1), ep(r_2)) \notin D_P$ .
2. Otherwise, conditions 1 and 2 in Definition 2.1 hold for all states  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ .

```

r1: post(t1,e1,t); // runs on thread t1
r2: post(t2,e2,t); // runs on thread t2
h1 := {r3: post(t,e3,t); r4: y = 2;}
h2 := {r5: x = 5;}
h3 := {r6: x = -5;}

```

Figure 5: Pseudo code of an event-driven program.




Figure 7: Dependence graphs of some sequences in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  of the program in Figure 5.

In the definition above, we use the event-parallel dependence relation  $D_P$  to formalize single-threaded dependence between transitions of two handlers in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  and apply the constraints in Definition 2.1 to states in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  to define (1) dependence among transitions of the same event handler and (2) multi-threaded dependence. From the second condition in Definition 2.2, all posts are considered as *independent* of each other in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ .

**EXAMPLE 2.3.** The transitions  $r_5$  and  $r_6$  in Figure 5 run in two different event handlers but on the same thread  $t$ . Since in the event-parallel transition system, the handlers execute concurrently, we can inspect the effect of reordering  $r_5$  and  $r_6$  on a state where they are co-enabled. In particular, at state  $s_3$  in Figure 6, the sequence  $r_6.r_5$  reaches state  $s_{14}$ , whereas,  $r_5.r_6$  reaches  $s_{12}$  which differs from  $s_{14}$  in the value of  $x$ . Therefore,  $(r_5, r_6) \in D_P$  and by condition 1.B of Definition 2.2,  $(r_5, r_6) \in D$ .

The condition 1.A of Definition 2.2 requires that the ordering between  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  should not be fixed. Suppose the handler of  $e_1$  posts  $e_2$  but the two handlers do not have any pair of transitions that are in  $D_P$ . Recall that we do not track dependence through event queues. Nevertheless, since a **post** transition in  $e_1$  *enables*  $e_2$ , the transitions in the two handlers should be marked as dependent. This requirement is met through condition 1.A. Intuitively, it serves a purpose analogous to condition 1 of Definition 2.1.

If  $(r_i, r_j) \in D$ , we simply say that  $r_i$  and  $r_j$  are *dependent*. In practice, we over-approximate the dependence relation, for example, by considering all conflicting accesses to shared objects as dependent.

### 2.3 Dependence-covering Sets

Mazurkiewicz trace [16] forms the basis of POR for multi-threaded programs and event-driven programs where posts are considered dependent. Two transition sequences belong to the same Mazurkiewicz trace if they can be obtained from each other by reordering adjacent independent transitions. The objective of POR is to explore a representative sequence from each Mazurkiewicz trace. As pointed out in the Introduction, the reordering of posts (independent as per Definition 2.2) in a transition sequence  $w$  may not yield another sequence belonging to the same Mazurkiewicz trace (denoted  $[w]$ ) for two reasons: (1) it may reorder dependent transitions from the corresponding handlers and (2) some new transitions, not in  $w$ , may be pulled in.

We elaborate on the second point. Suppose in  $w$ , a handler  $h_1$  executes before another handler  $h_2$ , both on the same thread,

such that  $h_2$  is executed only partially in  $w$ . Let us reorder the post operations for these two and obtain a transition sequence  $w'$ . Since the handlers run to completion, in order to include all the transitions of  $h_1$  (executed in  $w$ ) in  $w'$ , we must complete execution of  $h_2$ . However, as  $h_2$  is only partially executed in  $w$ , this results in including *new*—previously unexplored—transitions of  $h_2$  in  $w'$ . This renders  $w$  and  $w'$  inequivalent by the notion of Mazurkiewicz equivalence.

We therefore propose an alternative notion, suitable to correlate two transition sequences in event-driven multi-threaded programs, called the *dependence-covering sequence*. The objective of our reduction is to explore a dependence-covering sequence  $u$  at a state  $s$  for any transition sequence  $w$  starting at  $s$ .

Let  $w : r_1.r_2 \dots r_n$  and  $u : r'_1.r'_2 \dots r'_m$  be two transition sequences from the same state  $s$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  reaching states  $s_n$  and  $s'_m$  respectively. Let  $R_w = \{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$  and  $R_u = \{r'_1, \dots, r'_m\}$ .

**Definition 2.4.** The transition sequence  $u$  is called a **dependence-covering sequence** of  $w$  if (i) all the transitions in  $w$  are in  $u$  but  $u$  can have more transitions than  $w$  (i.e.,  $R_w \subseteq R_u$ ) and (ii) for each pair of dependent transitions  $r'_i, r'_j \in R_u$  such that  $i < j$ , any one among the following conditions holds:

1.  $r'_i$  and  $r'_j$  are executed in  $w$  and their relative order in  $u$  is consistent with that in  $w$ .
2.  $r'_i$  is executed in  $w$  and  $r'_j \in \text{nextTrans}(s_n)$ .
3.  $r'_i$  is not executed in  $w$ ,  $r'_j \in \text{nextTrans}(s_n)$  and  $w$  can be extended in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  such that  $r'_i$  executes before  $r'_j$ .
4. Irrespective of whether  $r'_i$  is executed in  $w$  or not,  $r'_j$  is not in  $R_w \cup \text{nextTrans}(s_n)$ .

The condition (i) above allows new transitions, that are not in  $w$ , to be part of  $u$ . The condition (ii) restricts how the new transitions may interfere with the dependences exhibited in  $w$  and also requires all the dependences in  $w$  to be maintained in  $u$ . These conditions permit dependence-covering sequence to be a relaxation of Mazurkiewicz trace, making it more suitable for stateless model checking of event-driven multi-threaded programs where posts may be reordered selectively.

As an example, let  $w_1, w_2$  and  $w_3$  be the three transition sequences in Figure 6 which correspond to valid sequences in the transition system  $\mathcal{S}_G$  of the program in Figure 5. The sequences of transitions in  $w_1, w_2$  and  $w_3$  are listed in Figure 7. To illustrate dependence-covering sequences, we visualize the dependences in these sequences as directed graphs, called dependence graphs, in Figure 7. The nodes in the dependence graph of a transition sequence  $w$  represent transitions in  $w$ . If a transition  $r_i$  executes before another transition  $r_j$  in  $w$  such that  $r_i$  and  $r_j$  are dependent then we draw an edge from  $r_i$  to  $r_j$ . The sequences  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are dependence-covering sequences of each other. As can be seen in Figure 7(a), their dependence graphs are identical. Also, both  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are dependence-covering sequences of a sequence  $w_4 = r_2.r_5$ . The dependence graph of  $w_4$  is isomorphic to a subgraph (enclosed in a rectangular box) of Figure 7(a). For transitions  $r_1, r_3, r_4$  and  $r_6$  which do not belong to this subgraph, there are no restrictions on dependences among themselves. However, by Definition 2.4, there can be no incoming edge to the subgraph from nodes not in the subgraph. Note that  $w_4$  and  $w_1$  (or  $w_2$ ) do not belong to the same Mazurkiewicz trace. The sequence  $w_3$  is not a dependence-covering sequence of  $w_4$  since there is an interfering dependence  $(r_6, r_5) \in D$  to the transition  $r_5$  executed in  $w_4$ . Pic-torially, we can see an incoming edge from  $r_6$  to  $r_5$  in Figure 7(b).

**Definition 2.5.** A non-empty subset  $L$  of transitions enabled at a state  $s$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  is a **dependence-covering set** in  $s$  iff, for all non-empty sequences of transitions  $w : r_1 \dots r_n$  starting at  $s$ , there

exists a dependence-covering sequence  $u : r'_1 \dots r'_m$  of  $w$  starting at  $s$  such that  $r'_1 \in L$ .

**EXAMPLE 2.6.** All the transition sequences connecting state  $s_0$  to state  $s_5$  in Figure 2 are dependence-covering sequences of each other. Thus, each of  $\{r_1\}$ ,  $\{r_2\}$  and  $\{r_1, r_2\}$  are dependence-covering sets at  $s_0$ . Even if we take a prefix  $\sigma$  of any of these sequences, the shaded sequence in Figure 2 is a dependence-covering sequence of  $\sigma$ .

In Figure 4,  $\{r_2\}$  and  $\{r_1, r_2\}$  are individually dependence-covering sets at state  $s_0$ , whereas,  $\{r_1\}$  is not a dependence-covering set at  $s_0$ .

For efficient stateless model checking of event-driven multi-threaded programs, we can explore a reduced state space using dependence-covering sets.

**Definition 2.7.** A **dependence-covering state space** of an event-driven multi-threaded program  $A$  is a reduced state space  $\mathcal{S}_R \subseteq \mathcal{S}_G$  obtained by selectively exploring only the transitions in a dependence-covering set at each state in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  reached from  $s_{init}$ .

The objective of a POR approach is to show that even while exploring a reduced state space, no concurrency bug is missed w.r.t. the complete but possibly much larger state space. The exploration of a dependence-covering state space satisfies this objective. The following theorem states the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 2.8.** Let  $\mathcal{S}_R$  be a dependence-covering state space of an event-driven multi-threaded program  $A$  with a finite and acyclic state space  $\mathcal{S}_G$ . Then, all deadlock cycles in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  are reachable in  $\mathcal{S}_R$ . If there exists a state  $v$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  which violates an assertion  $\alpha$  defined over local variables then there exists a state  $v'$  in  $\mathcal{S}_R$  which violates  $\alpha$ .

The proof follows from the appropriate restrictions on allowed dependences in a dependence-covering sequence  $u$  compared to the dependences in  $w$  where  $w$  is required to reach a deadlock cycle or an assertion violation in the complete state space. We provide a complete proof of the above theorem in Appendix A.

The set  $\{r_1, r_2\}$  is both a persistent set and a dependence-covering set at state  $s_0$  in Figure 2. We observe that in general, a persistent set  $P$  at a state  $s \in \mathcal{S}_G$  is also a dependence-covering set at  $s$ . Here, persistent set is defined using the dependence relation where posts to the same event queue are dependent, whereas, dependence-covering set is defined using the dependence relation where they are not (more formally, using Definition 2.2). We present a proof of this claim in Appendix B. Note that a dependence-covering set need not be a persistent set. As seen in Example 2.6,  $\{r_1\}$  and  $\{r_2\}$  are both dependence-covering sets at  $s_0$  in Figure 2 but they are not persistent sets.

### 3. Dynamic Algorithm to Compute Dependence-covering Sets

This section describes the EM-DPOR algorithm for model checking event-driven multi-threaded programs to explore a dependence-covering state space (see Definition 2.7).

Our algorithm, called EM-DPOR, extends DPOR [6] to compute dependence-covering sets. DPOR performs depth first traversal on the transition system of a program. Instead of exploring all the enabled transitions at a state, it only explores transitions added as backtracking choices by the steps of the algorithm which guarantees exploring a persistent set at each visited state. On exploring a sequence  $w$  reaching a state  $s'$ , and seeing dependence between a transition  $r' \in \text{nextTrans}(s')$  and a transition  $r$  executed at a state  $s$  reached by a prefix of  $w$ , DPOR adds backtracking choices at state  $s$ , so as to reorder  $r$  and  $r'$  eventually. However, not every pair of dependent transitions can be reordered. For example, a

pair of dependent transitions where one transition enables the other, cannot be reordered. DPOR uses a dependence relation which implicitly considers every adjacent pair of transitions executed on the same thread as dependent, because executing a transition on a thread enables the execution of the next transition. Hence, DPOR only attempts to reorder dependent transitions which *may be co-enabled*, i.e., atleast executed on different threads. However, a pair of dependent transitions executed on different threads may have a strict ordering between them in a given execution, making them unsuitable for reordering at any state reached in that execution. DPOR uses *happens-before relation*, a partial order relation on dependent transitions, to capture the ordering between dependent transitions in a transition sequence. Such a happens-before relation totally orders the transitions executed on the same thread. DPOR reorders only those may be co-enabled dependent transitions which are not ordered by happens-before relation in the explored sequence.

EM-DPOR uses the dependence relation defined by Definition 2.2, to identify dependent transitions. A happens-before relation based on this dependence relation does not totally order all the transitions executed on the same thread, and restricts the total ordering only within a task (due to the second condition in Definition 2.2). Analogously, EM-DPOR attempts to reorder a pair of dependent transitions which *may be co-enabled* or executed in handlers of *may be reordered* events on the same thread. Typically, dynamic POR algorithms only reorder dependent transitions i.e., they add backtracking choices only at a state which executes a transition  $r$  dependent with another transition  $r'$  such that  $r$  and  $r'$  are identified for reordering. This is not the case with EM-DPOR. Due to atomic execution of event handlers and FIFO processing of events in a queue, reordering a pair of dependent transitions from different handlers on the same thread would require reordering their corresponding posts. Transitions posting to the same event queue may have to be reordered even to reorder dependent transitions on different threads, as shown for Figure 4 in Section 1. Hence, EM-DPOR *selectively* reorders posts to the same queue even though the dependence relation used by EM-DPOR considers all the pairs of posts to be independent. When attempting to reorder a transition  $r$  executed at a state  $s$  and a dependent transition  $r'$ , if EM-DPOR fails to add backtracking choices at state  $s$  then, EM-DPOR employs a recursive strategy to dynamically identify and reorder certain posts to the same event queue. As will be explained in Example 3.5, EM-DPOR requires the enforced ordering between such selectively reordered post operations to be captured. Hence, the happens-before relation that we use with EM-DPOR is defined to be a partial order on dependent transitions as well as selectively reordered posts.

We now formally define *reordered (selectively) posts* and the happens-before relation used by our algorithm. We also define a few functions that will be used in the rest of the section, and a notion of *diverging posts* that will be used by EM-DPOR to reorder a pair of dependent transitions from different event handlers on the same thread.

**Reordered posts.** We define a function  $reorderedPosts(p, w)$  which takes a transition  $p$  posting an event to a thread  $t$ 's queue and a sequence  $w$  explored by EM-DPOR where  $p$  is executed in  $w$ , and returns a set  $P$  of transitions such that a transition  $p'$  is a member of  $P$  if the following conditions hold:

1.  $p'$  also posts an event to thread  $t$ 's queue.
2. There exists a prefix  $w_1$  of  $w$  such that  $w = w_1.w_2$ ,  $w_1$  reaches a state  $s$ ,  $p$  is executed in  $w_2$ , and the following holds:
  - (A) EM-DPOR has already explored a sequence  $w_1.w_3$  where  $w_3 = p.a_1 \dots a_i.p'.a_{i+1} \dots a_m$ , each  $a_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$

is a transition, and has added backtracking choices at state  $s$  to reorder post transitions  $p$  and  $p'$ , and

- (B)  $p'$  is a transition in  $w_2$  such that  $index(w_2, p') < index(w_2, p)$ .

**Happens-before Relation.** We extend the happens-before relation defined in [6] with the FIFO rule in [12, 14] and a rule to capture ordering between reordered posts.

**Definition 3.1.** The *happens-before relation*  $\rightarrow_w$  for a transition sequence  $w : r_1.r_2 \dots r_n$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  explored by EM-DPOR is the smallest relation on  $dom(w)$  such that the following conditions hold:

1. If  $i < j$  and  $r_i$  is dependent with  $r_j$  then  $i \rightarrow_w j$ .
2. If  $r_i$  and  $r_j$  are transitions posting events  $e$  and  $e'$  respectively to the same thread, such that  $i \rightarrow_w j$  and the handler of  $e$  has finished and that of  $e'$  has started in  $w$ , then  $getEnd(w, e) \rightarrow_w getBegin(w, e')$ . This is the FIFO rule.
3. If  $r_j$  is a post transition and  $r_i \in reorderedPosts(r_j, w)$  such that  $i = \max(\{l \mid r_l \in reorderedPosts(r_j, w)\})$  then  $i \rightarrow_w j$ .
4.  $\rightarrow_w$  is transitively closed.

The relation  $\rightarrow_w$  is defined over transitions in  $w$ . We overload  $\rightarrow_w$  to relate transitions in  $w$  with those in the  $nextTrans$  set in the last state, say  $s$ , reached by  $w$ . For a task  $(t, e)$  having a transition in  $nextTrans(s)$ ,  $i \rightarrow_w (t, e)$  if either (a)  $task(r_i) = (t, e)$  or (b)  $\exists k \in dom(w)$  such that  $i \rightarrow_w k$  and  $task(r_k) = (t, e)$ .

We note that unlike the happens-before relation defined in [6], the happens-before relation defined above captures some information related to sequences rooted at states reached by prefixes of  $w$  explored by EM-DPOR prior to exploring  $w$ . This is required to add happens-before mapping between reordered posts.

On a transition sequence  $w$  explored by EM-DPOR, we define another happens-before relation  $\rightsquigarrow_w$ . While  $\rightarrow_w$  totally orders only those transitions executed within the same task,  $\rightsquigarrow_w$  totally orders all the transitions executed on the same thread even if they belong to different event handlers.

**Definition 3.2.** The *happens-before relation*  $\rightsquigarrow_w$  for a transition sequence  $w : r_1.r_2 \dots r_n$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  explored by EM-DPOR is the smallest relation on  $dom(w)$  such that the following conditions hold:

1. For  $i, j \in dom(w)$ , if  $i \rightarrow_w j$  then  $i \rightsquigarrow_w j$ .
2. If  $i, j \in dom(w)$  such that  $i < j$  and  $thread(r_i) = thread(r_j)$  then  $i \rightsquigarrow_w j$ .
3.  $\rightsquigarrow_w$  is transitively closed.

In the rest of the paper *happens-before* between a pair of transitions in a sequence  $w$  refers to the relation  $\rightarrow_w$  defined by Definition 3.1, whenever  $\rightsquigarrow_w$  is not explicitly referred.

**Diverging posts.** For a transition  $r$  in a transition sequence  $w$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ , let  $postChain(r, w) = p_m.p_{m-1} \dots p_1$  be the maximal sequence of post transitions in  $w$  such that  $p_{i-1}$  is a transition in the handler of the event posted by  $p_i$  for  $m \geq i > 1$ , and  $p_1$  posts the event whose handler executes  $r$ . Let  $r$  and  $r'$  be transitions of two handlers running on the same thread such that  $postChain(r, w) = p_k \dots p_1$  and  $postChain(r', w) = q_l \dots q_1$ . Then,  $divergingPosts(r, r', w)$  is a pair of posts  $(p_i, q_i)$  where  $i$  is the smallest index in the post-chains of  $r$  and  $r'$  in sequence  $w$  such that  $thread(p_i) \neq thread(q_i)$ . In Figure 3,  $divergingPosts(r_3, r_4, r_1 \dots r_6) = (r_1, r_2)$ . Diverging posts are undefined if there exists an index  $j$  such that  $task(p_j) = task(q_j)$  and for all  $i < j$ ,  $thread(p_i) = thread(q_i)$ .

The order of execution of diverging posts of  $r$  and  $r'$  uniquely determines the order of execution of  $r$  and  $r'$ . In Figure 3, the order of execution of  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  uniquely determines the order of execution of  $r_3$  and  $r_4$ . If  $r$  and  $r'$  do not have diverging posts, their relative order of execution is fixed.

**Basic definitions.** Function  $enabled(s)$  gives the set of threads whose next transitions are enabled at a state  $s$ . Consider a transition sequence  $w : r_1 \dots r_n$  from the initial state  $s_{init}$  of a given event-driven multi-threaded program. The function  $last(w)$  gives the last state reached by following  $w$ . If  $w$  is empty, it is the initial state. For an index  $k \in dom(w)$ ,  $pre(w, k)$  is the state before executing transition  $r_k$ . The function  $getPost(w, e)$  gives the transition in  $w$  which posted the event  $e$ . Function  $event(r)$  gives the event corresponding to the handler which executes  $r$  (this is  $nil$  if  $r$  is executed by a thread without an event queue). For a thread  $t$  with an event queue, the function  $executable(s, t)$  returns the event whose handler can perform the next transition on  $t$  in a state  $s$ , whereas  $blockedEv(s, t)$  returns the set of events present in  $t$ 's queue in state  $s$  that are not executable. We say that a task  $(t, e)$  is executable at a state  $s$  if  $t$  is a thread without a queue ( $e = nil$ ), or  $e = executable(s, t)$ . Function  $dest(r)$  takes a transition  $r$  posting an event as input and returns the destination event queue. Datastructures  $backtrack(s)$  and  $done(s)$  respectively track the threads added as backtracking choices at a state  $s$ , and the threads already explored from a state  $s$  during the DFS traversal.

### 3.1 Overview of EM-DPOR Algorithm

The EM-DPOR algorithm has two components: (1) a depth first search based explorer called *Explore*, and (2) a recursive routine called *FindTarget* to compute backtracking points and choices for a pair of reorderable dependent transitions. We now give an overview of *Explore* and *FindTarget*.

**Explore.** Algorithm *Explore*, given as Algorithm 1, takes a transition sequence  $w$  as input and obtains the current state  $s = last(w)$  (line 1). Initially,  $w$  is empty.

The loop at lines 2–4 iterates over all threads  $t$  and identifies transitions from  $w$  that have a race with  $next(s, t)$ . A transition  $r_i$  has a race with  $next(s, t)$  if they are dependent and may be co-enabled (if  $thread(r_i) \neq t$ ) or may be reordered (if  $event(r_i)$  and  $event(next(s, t))$  may be reordered), and  $r_i$  does not have a happens-before relation with the task that executes  $next(s, t)$ . The algorithm selects a transition  $r_i$  which satisfies the above requirements and has the highest index in  $w$ . It then invokes the recursive routine *FindTarget* at line 3 to compute backtracking choices to reorder  $r_i$  and  $next(s, t)$ , and if required, identify posts to same thread for selective reordering.

Lines 5–14 perform a selective depth first traversal starting at state  $s$  reached by  $w$ . The algorithm *Explore* is called recursively by extending the current transition sequence with an outgoing transition  $r$  of a thread  $t \in backtrack(s)$  from  $s$ , such that  $t$  is not already explored from  $s$  i.e.,  $t \notin done(s)$ . Lines 9–11 are executed only if the transition  $r$  executed at state  $s$  reached by  $w$ , is a post transition with a non-empty set of reordered posts. We now explain intuitions for line 10 which adds  $r$ 's thread as a backtracking choice at a state from where  $r$ 's nearest reordered post is executed.

Line 3 identifies pairs of dependent transitions for reordering such that only one of the transitions is already executed in  $w$  and the two transitions are not ordered by happens-before relation. Happens-before mapping is added between a pair of transitions identified by the rules of Definition 3.1 only after both the transitions are executed. Hence, line 3 identifies those dependent transitions for reordering which may only be ordered by condition 1 of Definition 3.1 in an extension to  $w$ , and not due to transitivity or FIFO rules. If the transition  $r = next(s, t)$  has a post operation

such that a transition  $r_k$  in  $w$  is its nearest reordered post then, a happens-before ordering is enforced due to condition 3 in Definition 3.1. Due to FIFO and transitive happens-before ordering, the happens-before mapping from  $r_k$  to  $r$  results in ordering transitions across some of the handlers corresponding to post chains originating from  $r_k$  and  $r$ ; consequently, dependent transitions which could otherwise be identified by line 3 for reordering may get ordered by happens-before. Transition  $r$  is enabled in  $pre(w, k)$  — state from which  $r_k$  is executed, as  $r_k \in reorderedPosts(r, w, r)$  (due to definition of reordered posts). Hence, line 10 adds thread  $t$  as a backtracking choice at  $pre(w, k)$ , so as to not miss alternate orderings between dependent transitions ordered due to enforced happens-before between reordered post operations.

**FindTarget.** *Explore* invokes *FindTarget* (Algorithm 2) to compute backtracking choices to reorder a pair of dependent transitions  $r$  and  $r'$ . Let  $i$  be the index of  $r$  in  $w$  and  $s$  be the state from which  $r = r_i$  is executed (line 1). If *FindTarget* fails to identify backtracking choices to be added to  $backtrack(s)$ , then it identifies posts for selective reordering and recursively invokes itself to compute corresponding backtracking choices. Among other criteria, a recursive call terminates when a happens-before ordering between  $r$  and  $r'$  is detected (line 2). Transitions  $r$  and  $r'$  may be co-enabled or they may belong to different event handlers on the same thread. In the latter case, we first identify a pair of post operations executed on different threads which need to be reordered so as to reorder  $r$  and  $r'$ . *FindTarget* operates in four main steps explained below, of which Steps 2 - 4 are applicable only when  $thread(r) \neq thread(r')$  and Step 1 only when  $thread(r) = thread(r')$ .

**Step 1.** Transitions  $r$  and  $r'$  may be from different tasks on the same thread. Such transitions can only be reordered by reordering their diverging posts. Line 3 therefore recursively invokes *FindTarget* on post operations of  $r$  and  $r'$ . This way it simultaneously walks up  $postChain(r, w)$  and  $postChain(r', w)$  on each recursive call to *FindTarget* till it finds  $divergingPosts(r, r', w)$ . On reaching the diverging posts, the condition  $thread(r) = thread(r')$  — where  $r$  and  $r'$  are diverging posts — evaluates to false and the control goes to Step 2.

**Step 2.** This step is reached only when  $thread(r) \neq thread(r')$ . Similar to DPOR's computation of backtracking choices, this step computes threads to be added to  $backtrack(s)$  to facilitate executing  $r'$  before  $r$  in a future run. Lines 4–5 compute a set *candidates* consisting of  $task(r')$  and tasks that have a transition, executed after  $r$ , with a happens-before ordering with  $r'$ . Line 6 retains only those tasks in *candidates* whose threads are enabled at  $s$ , so that one such thread can be explored from  $s$  to eventually achieve the reordering.

Threads whose transitions are already explored from state  $s$  are added to *done* set at  $s$  by line 12 in Algorithm 1. For a task  $(t, e) \in candidates$ , it is possible that its thread  $t$  is already in *done(s)*. In case of a purely multi-threaded program, this would imply that the intended order between  $r'$  and  $r$  has already been explored. Hence, DPOR picks any *candidate* thread and adds it to the backtracking set even if the thread has already been explored from that state [6]. However, this reasoning need not hold in the presence of events. This is because for a task  $(t, e) \in candidates$  such that  $t \in done(s)$ , event  $e$  may be blocked on its queue in state  $s$  — which means  $t \in done(s)$  due to exploration of the executable task on  $t$  in a prior run. However, the executable task on  $t$  may not even have any happens-before ordering with  $r'$ . In which case exploring it from state  $s$  may either not have explored the required order between  $r'$  and  $r$ , or may not have preserved the

```

1 Let  $s = \text{last}(w)$ 
2 foreach thread  $t$  do
3   if  $\exists i = \max(\{i \in \text{dom}(w) \mid r_i \text{ is dependent and (may be co-enabled or reordered with } \text{next}(s, t)) \text{ and } i \not\rightarrow_w \text{task}(\text{next}(s, t))\})$ 
     then  $\text{FindTarget}(w, r_i, \text{next}(s, t))$  // Identify backtracking point and choice to reorder  $r_i$  and  $\text{next}(s, t)$ 
4 end
5 if  $\exists t \in \text{enabled}(s)$  then
6   Let  $\text{backtrack}(s) = \{t\}$  and  $\text{done}(s) = \emptyset$ 
   // Perform selective depth-first traversal
7   while  $\exists t \in (\text{backtrack}(s) \setminus \text{done}(s))$  do
8     Let  $r = \text{next}(s, t)$ ; Execute transition  $r$ 
9     if  $r$  is a post operation then
10      if  $\exists k = \max(\{k \in \text{dom}(w) \mid r_k \in \text{reorderedPosts}(r, w.r)\})$  then Add thread  $t$  to  $\text{backtrack}(\text{pre}(w, k))$ 
11    end
12    Add  $t$  to  $\text{done}(s)$ ;  $\text{Explore}(w \cdot r)$ 
13  end
14 end

```

**Algorithm 1:** Algorithm Explore whose input is a transition sequence  $w : r_1 \dots r_n$ .

```

1 Let  $i = \text{index}(w, r)$  and  $s = \text{pre}(w, i)$ 
2 if  $r' \notin \text{nextTrans}(\text{last}(w))$  and  $i \rightarrow_w \text{index}(w, r')$  then return
   // Step 1: Recursively search for diverging posts and identify backtracking choices to reorder them
3 if  $\text{thread}(r) = \text{thread}(r')$  then  $\text{FindTarget}(w, \text{getPost}(w, \text{event}(r)), \text{getPost}(w, \text{event}(r')))$ ; return end
   // Step 2: Compute backtracking choices to reorder transitions from distinct threads
4 if  $r' \in \text{nextTrans}(\text{last}(w))$  then Let  $\text{candidates} = \{\text{task}(r_k) \mid \exists k \in \text{dom}(w) : k > i \text{ and } k \rightarrow_w \text{task}(r')\} \cup \text{task}(r')$ 
5 else Let  $\text{candidates} = \{\text{task}(r_k) \mid \exists k \in \text{dom}(w) : k > i \text{ and } k \rightarrow_w \text{index}(w, r')\} \cup \text{task}(r')$ 
6  $\text{candidates} = \{(t, e) \mid (t, e) \in \text{candidates} \text{ and } t \in \text{enabled}(s)\}$ 
7 Let  $\text{unexplored} = \{t \mid (t, e) \in \text{candidates}\} \setminus \text{done}(s)$ 
8 if  $\text{unexplored} \neq \emptyset$  then Add any  $t \in \text{unexplored}$  to  $\text{backtrack}(\text{pre}(w, i))$ ; return end
   // Step 3: Recursively search for backtracking choices to make a pending (blocked) event executable
9 Let  $\text{pending} = \{(t, e) \in \text{candidates} \mid e \in \text{blockedEv}(s, t)\}$ 
10 if  $\text{pending} \neq \emptyset$  then  $\text{ReschedulePending}(w, \text{pending}, r)$  // See Algorithm 3
11 else // Step 4: Handle scenarios where all the tasks in  $\text{candidates}$  are executable, or  $\text{candidates} = \emptyset$ 
12   Let  $ts = \{t \mid (t, e) \in \text{candidates}\}$ 
13   if  $ts \neq \emptyset$  then Add any  $t \in ts$  to  $\text{backtrack}(\text{pre}(w, i))$  else  $\text{BacktrackEager}(w, i, r')$  // See Algorithm 4

```

**Algorithm 2:** Algorithm FindTarget whose inputs are (1) a transition sequence  $w : r_1 \dots r_n$ , (2) a transition  $r$  from  $w$  and (3) a transition  $r'$  which may or may not belong to  $w$ .

required order between other pairs of dependent transitions when  $r'$  is executed before  $r$  in a prior run.

Hence, lines 7–8 compute  $\text{unexplored}$  to be a set of threads corresponding to tasks in  $\text{candidates}$  which are not in  $\text{done}(s)$ , and add some thread in  $\text{unexplored}$  to  $\text{backtrack}(s)$  if  $\text{unexplored} \neq \emptyset$ . However,  $\text{unexplored} = \emptyset$ , i.e., all the threads with transitions that *happen-before*  $r'$  are already explored from  $s$ , does not imply that  $r'$  cannot be reordered with  $r$  or EM-DPOR has already seen a run where  $r'$  is explored before  $r$ . Rather it indicates that we need to adopt a different strategy to achieve the reordering. This is illustrated through an example below.

**EXAMPLE 3.3.** In sequence  $w$  of Figure 3, transitions  $r_3$  and  $r_6$  are dependent, may be co-enabled and do not have a happens-before ordering. When Explore invokes FindTarget to compute backtracking choices to reorder  $r_3$  and  $r_6$ , Step 1 is skipped as  $\text{thread}(r_3) \neq \text{thread}(r_6)$ . Step 2 computes  $\text{candidates} = \{(t_1, e_2)\}$  as  $t_1$  is enabled at  $s_2$  (see Figure 4), and  $r_4$  executed in  $(t_1, e_2)$  forks  $t_4$  and thus happens-before  $r_6$ . However,  $t_1$  is already executed from  $s_2$  and is in  $\text{done}(s_2)$ . Yet, as can be seen in Figure 4,  $r_3$  and  $r_6$  can be reordered; but by reordering  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  posting events  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  respectively. But adding thread  $t_1$  corre-

sponding to the only task  $(t_1, e_2)$  in  $\text{candidates}$  will not achieve this reordering. Step 3 explains our technique to handle such cases.

**Step 3.** In this step, line 9 computes a set  $\text{pending}$  which is a subset of tasks in  $\text{candidates}$  whose events are blocked in their event queues in state  $s$ . If set  $\text{pending}$  is not empty, line 10 invokes ReschedulePending. Intuitively, ReschedulePending identifies a set of events blocked in  $s$  to be reordered with their corresponding executable events i.e., it performs selective reordering of posts to same thread so as to eventually reorder  $r$  and  $r'$  executed on different threads. We present its details in Section 3.2.

**Step 4.** Finally, the set  $\text{pending}$  being empty implies that all the tasks in  $\text{candidates}$  are executable at state  $s$  or  $\text{candidates}$  itself is empty. FindTarget computes a set of threads  $ts$  corresponding to each task in  $\text{candidates}$ . If the set  $ts$  is non-empty, it only means that another ordering of  $r$  and  $r'$  is already explored in a past run as all the threads in  $ts$  are already in  $\text{done}(s)$  (due to lines 7–8), and the algorithm trivially adds any thread from  $ts$  to  $\text{backtrack}(s)$  (line 13). If  $ts = \emptyset$  which means  $\text{candidates} = \emptyset$ , FindTarget invokes BacktrackEager (explained in Section 3.3) at line 13.

```

1 Let  $i = \text{index}(w, r)$  and  $s = \text{pre}(w, i)$  // Step 3a: Initialization
2 Let  $(t_k, e_k)$  be any task in pending,  $\text{worklist} = \{(t_k, \text{executable}(s, t_k))\}$  and  $\text{swapMap}[t_k] := \{e_k\}$ 
   // Step 3b: Identify relevant blocked events to be reordered with executable events at state  $s$ 
3 while  $\text{worklist} \neq \emptyset$  do
4   Remove a task  $(t_j, e_j)$  from set worklist // Note that  $(t_j, e_j)$  is the executable task of thread  $t_j$  in state  $s$ 
5   Let  $C = \{(t, e) \mid \exists l \in \text{dom}(w) : (t, e) = \text{task}(r_l) \text{ and } e \in \text{blockedEv}(s, t) \text{ and } l \rightarrow_w \text{getEnd}(w, e_j) \text{ and } i \rightsquigarrow_w \text{getEnd}(w, \text{executable}(s, t))\}$ 
6   foreach  $(t, e) \in C$  do
7      $\text{worklist} = \text{worklist} \cup \{(t, \text{executable}(s, t))\}$ ; Add event  $e$  to the set  $\text{swapMap}[t]$ 
8   end
9 end
10 foreach thread  $t$  such that  $\text{swapMap}[t] \neq \emptyset$  do // Step 3c: Reorder blocked and executable events identified by Step 3b
11   Let  $e$  be the last event posted to  $t$ 's queue among events from  $\text{swapMap}[t]$ 
12   Let  $r = \text{getPost}(w, \text{executable}(s, t))$  and  $r' = \text{getPost}(w, e)$ 
13   FindTarget( $w, r, r'$ ) // Compute backtracking choices to get a blocked event at  $s$  to the front of its queue
14 end

```

**Algorithm 3:** Algorithm ReschedulePending whose inputs are (1) a transition sequence  $w : r_1 \dots r_n$ , (2) a set of tasks called *pending* whose events are posted in  $w$  and (3) a transition  $r$  from  $w$ .

### 3.2 Selective Reordering of Blocked and Executable Events (Algorithm ReschedulePending)

ReschedulePending (Algorithm 3) is invoked by Algorithm 2 on line 10 in Step 3 of FindTarget when a transition  $r = r_i$  executed from a state  $s$  in sequence  $w$  explored by EM-DPOR has to be reordered with a transition  $r'$  on another thread, and Step 2 fails to add backtracking choices to  $\text{backtrack}(s)$ . ReschedulePending is called only if the *candidate* set of tasks computed by Step 2 has a set of tasks with their events blocked in state  $s$  such that their corresponding executable tasks are already explored from  $s$ . Then, Algorithm 3 identifies suitable events blocked in  $s$  to be reordered with executable events on their corresponding queues, attempting to co-enable  $r$  and  $r'$  facilitating their reordering.




Figure 8: An example requiring selective reordering of events

We first discuss an example scenario to illustrate the challenges involved in identifying events for reordering. Figure 8(a) depicts a partial transition sequence  $v$  for threads  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  with event queues, explored by EM-DPOR. Let  $(r, r')$  and  $(p, p')$  symbolically represent pairs of may be co-enabled dependent transitions. The events corresponding to the tasks  $r, r', p$  and  $p'$  are indicated in the figure. Let  $r$  be executed at a state  $s$ . Assume that  $t_2 \in \text{enabled}(s)$  and not in  $\text{done}(s)$ . Then, FindTarget called to reorder  $r$  and  $r'$  computes  $\text{candidates} = \{(t_2, e_4)\}$  and adds thread  $t_2$  to  $\text{backtrack}(s)$ . Exploring  $t_2$  from state  $s$  eventually results in a transition sequence, say  $v'$ , depicted in Figure 8(b). When FindTarget is invoked to reorder  $p'$  and  $p$  in  $v'$ , Step 2 computes  $\text{candidates} = \{(t_1, e_2)\}$ . However,  $t_1 \in \text{done}(s)$  and hence  $\text{unexplored} = \emptyset$ . Since the event  $e_2$  is blocked on its queue in state  $s$ , line 9 in Algorithm 2 computes  $\text{pending} = \{(t_1, e_2)\}$  and invokes ReschedulePending so as to reorder relevant event

pairs. If the event pairs  $e_1 - e_2$  and  $e_3 - e_4$  cannot be reordered, then transitions  $p'$  and  $p$  cannot be further reordered. Then, a run where  $r'$  is executed prior to its dependent transition  $r$  while  $p$  is executed prior to  $p'$  (depicted in Figure 8(c - d)) is not feasible. Such a scenario is analogous to a case where transition pairs  $r - p$  and  $r' - p'$  are executed within the same task respectively, thus presenting restricted scope for reordering. However, if either or both of  $e_1 - e_2$  and  $e_3 - e_4$  event pairs may be reordered then, EM-DPOR has scope to explore more partial orders between dependent transitions.

Figure 8(c) and (d) respectively show how  $p$  can be executed prior to  $p'$  while keeping the ordering between  $r'$  and  $r$  same as that in sequence  $v'$ , when the blocked - executable event pairs at state  $s$ ,  $e_4 - e_3$  and  $e_2 - e_1$  are reordered. Assume that a transition  $q$  in  $e_1$ 's handler is dependent with a transition  $q'$  in  $e_2$ 's handler, in which case reordering events  $e_1 - e_2$  breaks the ordering between  $q$  and  $q'$ . In such a scenario, reordering  $e_3 - e_4$  would have preserved the ordering between both transition pairs  $r' - r$  and  $q - q'$  same as that in sequence  $v'$ , while reordering  $p'$  and  $p$  as depicted in Figure 8(d). Similarly, reordering  $e_3 - e_4$  may have reordered a pair of dependent transitions other than  $r' - r$  making  $e_1 - e_2$  the right candidates for reordering. In general, reordering any arbitrary pair of events among the various relevant blocked - executable event pairs so as to co-enable and then reorder a pair of transitions identified by FindTarget, may not preserve the order between all the other pairs of dependent transitions. At the same time, selecting one right pair of events for reordering is highly non-trivial, as per our experience. Hence, Algorithm 3 computes backtracking choices to reorder all the relevant pairs of events, which in case of sequence  $v'$  are  $e_1 - e_2$  and  $e_3 - e_4$ .

It is intuitive to identify  $e_2 - e_1$  for reordering as the task  $(t_1, e_2)$  blocked in  $s$  is in set *candidates* computed by Step 2 of Algorithm 2 when reordering  $p'$  and  $p$  in  $v'$ . Since  $(t_1, e_1)$  is the corresponding executable task at  $s$ , reordering  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  seems to aid in co-enabling  $p'$  and  $p$ . We now explain how ReschedulePending picks  $e_4 - e_3$  for reordering, or in general how are blocked - executable event pairs identified when the blocked event's task is not in *candidates* and hence not in set *pending* passed as argument to ReschedulePending (see line 10 in Algorithm 2). The scenario explained in the example above can be generalized as follows. Consider a sequence  $v$  with  $n$  pairs of transitions  $(p_i, p'_i)$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , such that for  $1 \leq i < n$ ,  $p_i$  is a transition in a task  $(t_i, e_i)$  whereas  $p'_i$  is a transition in another task  $(t_i, e'_i)$  such that  $e_i$  is dequeued prior to  $e'_i$  and  $p'_i$  is dependent

or happens-before ( $\rightarrow_v$ ) a transition  $p_{i+1}$  in a task  $(t_{i+1}, e_{i+1})$  on another thread. Additionally,  $p_1$  is dependent with  $p_n$  or some transition that has happens-before with  $p'_n$ . The dependence structure of sequence  $v$  consisting only of transitions of interest, is given in Figure 9.




Figure 9: Partial dependence structure of sequence  $v$ . Directed edges indicate dependence or relation by  $\rightarrow_v$ . Transitions  $r_1$  and  $r'_n$  are related as explained in running text, even though we have not shown corresponding edge.

For simplicity assume  $p'_i$  to be dependent with  $p_{i+1}$ , for  $1 \leq i < n$ , and  $p_1$  to be dependent with  $p'_n$ . Assume  $p_1$  to be executed at a state  $s$ , and  $t_n$  is in  $enabled(s)$  and not in  $done(s)$ . Then, **FindTarget** called to reorder  $p_1$  and  $p'_n$  on a prefix of  $v$  adds  $t_n$  to  $backtrack(s)$ . Clearly, exploring  $t_n$  from  $s$  may reorder  $p'_n$  and  $p_1$  in a sequence  $v'$ , but it disturbs the ordering between dependent transitions  $p'_{n-1}$  and  $p_n$ . On attempting to reorder  $p'_{n-1}$  and  $p_n$  in  $v'$ , ordering between  $p'_{n-2}$  and  $p_{n-1}$  gets altered and so on. Similar to scenario explained in the prior example, eventually **FindTarget** fails to add any backtracking choice to  $backtrack(s)$  when attempting to reorder a pair  $p'_i$  and  $p_{i+1}$ . As explained for the earlier example, transitions  $p'_i - p_{i+1}$  (or  $p'_n - p_1$ ) can be reordered by reordering any of the event pairs  $e_i - e'_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Since it is hard to pick one right event pair for reordering among the  $n$  relevant event pairs, the algorithm needs to attempt to reorder all these  $n$  event pairs. It is easy to pick the blocked task, say  $(t_i, e'_i)$  (or  $(t_n, e'_n)$ ), in the set *candidates* computed by **FindTarget** when reordering  $p'_i - p_{i+1}$  (or  $p'_n - p_1$ ). The rest of the  $n - 1$  relevant blocked tasks can be identified with the help of happens-before mappings from a task blocked in  $s$  on one thread to a task executable in  $s$  on another thread, starting with the happens-before mapping from  $p'_{i-1}$  to  $p_i$  (or  $p'_{n-1}$  to  $p_n$ ). Additionally, we only want to identify those blocked tasks as relevant which will aid in reordering  $p'_i - p_{i+1}$  (or  $p'_n - p_1$ ). We can achieve this by looking for a relation between  $p_{i+1}$  (or  $p_1$ ) and a task blocked at  $s$ , established by the happens-before pattern shown in Figure 9. Such a relation can be captured by the happens-before relation  $\rightsquigarrow_w$  defined in Definition 3.2, which can relate a pair of transitions related by  $\rightarrow$  as well as those executed on different tasks on the same thread. We observe that in Figure 9, each transition  $p_i$  in the first task on each thread, for  $1 < i \leq n$ , is related to  $p_1$  by  $\rightsquigarrow_w$ . We now describe

**ReschedulePending** that identifies relevant blocked – executable event pairs for reordering using the insights presented above.

**Algorithm ReschedulePending.** Algorithm 3 takes a sequence  $w$  explored by EM-DPOR, a set of tasks *pending* (same as *pending* computed by **FindTarget**), and a transition  $r = r_i$  identified by **FindTarget** to be reordered with a transition  $r'$  as input. In Algorithm 3, variable *worklist* stores a subset of executable tasks in state  $s$ , and *swapMap* maintains a map from threads to a subset of events blocked on their respective queues at  $s$ . Line 2 in Step 3a picks any task  $(t_k, e_k)$  from set *pending* passed as argument, initializes *worklist* with the executable task on thread  $t_k$  and adds  $e_k$  to the set of blocked events maintained for thread  $t_k$  in *swapMap*. Step 3b (lines 3–9) initiated by a non-empty *worklist* identifies other relevant blocked events for reordering. This is required as it is hard to pick exactly one pair of relevant *blocked* – *executable* events for reordering, as explained earlier. Line 4 removes some executable task  $(t_j, e_j)$  from the *worklist*. Line 5 computes a set  $C$  of tasks blocked in  $s$  such that, a blocked task  $(t, e)$  is added to  $C$  if there exists a transition  $r_i$  in the handler of  $e$  which happens-before a transition in  $(t_j, e_j)$ . This essentially checks for the blocked task on one thread to executable task on another thread happens-before pattern, illustrated through Figure 9. Additionally, line 5 only retains those blocked tasks whose corresponding executable tasks in state  $s$  contain transitions which have happens-before relation with  $r$  through  $\rightsquigarrow_w$ . Lines 6–8 iterate on each blocked task in  $C$ , add corresponding executable task to *worklist* for further processing and store the event corresponding to blocked task in *swapMap*. We note that in case of scenario presented for sequence  $v$  in Figure 9, if  $t_n \in done(s)$  then, **FindTarget** called to reorder dependent transitions  $p_1$  and  $p'_n$  reach Step 3, compute *pending* =  $\{(t_n, e'_n)\}$  and invoke **ReschedulePending**. Step 3a of Algorithm 3 adds event  $e'_n$  corresponding to a *pending* task  $(t_n, e'_n)$  to the set *swapMap* $[t_n]$  and initializes *worklist* with the executable task  $(t_n, e_n)$ . Initiated by the executable task  $(t_n, e_n)$ , Step 3b iteratively adds  $e'_i$  to *swapMap* $[t_i]$  and  $(t_i, e_i)$  to *worklist* starting from  $i = n - 1$  to  $i = 1$ . The **while** loop exits on processing executable task  $(t_1, e_1)$  and not finding any more blocked events satisfying the constraints in line 5.

Lines 10–14 (Step 3c) iterate over the threads for which the set of blocked events *swapMap* $[t]$  is non-empty, pick the last event posted among events in set *swapMap* $[t]$ , and invoke **FindTarget** to reorder the post transition for the executable event at state  $s$  on thread  $t$  with that of the selected blocked event.

**EXAMPLE 3.4.** Continuing Example 3.3, Step 2 in **FindTarget** called to reorder  $r_3$  and  $r_6$  (Figure 3) fails to add any backtracking choices at state  $s_2$  (Figure 4). Then, Step 3 computes *pending* =  $\{(t_1, e_2)\}$  as  $e_2$  is blocked in  $s_2$ , and invokes **ReschedulePending**( $r_1 \dots r_5, \{(t_1, e_2)\}, r_3$ ). Line 2 in Algorithm 3 adds  $e_2$  to *swapMap* $[t_1]$ . Step 3b adds no more blocked events to *swapMap*. Step 3c calls **FindTarget**( $r_1 \dots r_5, r_1, r_2$ ) to reorder blocked event  $e_2$  with executable event  $e_1$  at state  $s_2$  on  $t_1$ . In the recursive call, state  $s_0$  (where  $r_1$  is executed) is identified as the backtracking point and Step 2 adds thread  $t_3$  to *backtrack*( $s_0$ ) as  $t_3$  executes  $r_2$ . Thus in a future run where  $r_2$  is explored before  $r_1, r_3$  and  $r_6$  get reordered as shown in Figure 4.

We now give another example to illustrate the working of EM-DPOR along with highlighting the role played by happens-before mappings added between reordered post operations by rule 3 in Definition 3.1.

**EXAMPLE 3.5.** Consider an execution trace  $z$ , shown in Figure 10(a), of a program in which two threads  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  have event queues. Transitions  $r_5$  and  $r_6$  post events  $e_5$  and  $e_6$  respectively to the same event queue. We assume that the event handlers of  $e_5$  and




Figure 10: An example demonstrating the working of EM-DPOR

```

1 foreach  $k \in \{2, \dots, i-1\}$  in the increasing order // Try to reorder nearest co-enabled post operations
2 do
3   Let  $\hat{w} = r_1 \dots r_{k-1}$ 
4   if  $r_k$  is a post operation and  $\exists j = \max(\{j \in \text{dom}(\hat{w}) \mid r_j \text{ is a post operation and } \text{dest}(r_j) = \text{dest}(r_k) \text{ and } j \not\rightarrow_w k\})$  then
5     Let  $ts = \{t \in \text{enabled}(\text{pre}(w, j)) \mid t = \text{thread}(r_k) \text{ or } (\exists l \in \text{dom}(\hat{w}) : l > j \text{ and } l \rightarrow_w k \text{ and } t = \text{thread}(r_l))\}$ 
6     if  $ts \neq \emptyset$  then Add any  $t \in ts$  to  $\text{backtrack}(\text{pre}(w, j))$  else Add all  $t \in \text{enabled}(\text{pre}(w, j))$  to  $\text{backtrack}(\text{pre}(w, j))$ 
7     Add  $j \rightarrow_w k$  to the happens-before relation  $\rightarrow_w$  and update  $\rightarrow_w$ 
8     if  $r_i$  has happens-before relation with  $r'$  in  $\rightarrow_w$  then return
9   end
10 end
    // Compute backtracking choices to reorder  $r$  and  $r'$  using extended happens-before relation  $\rightarrow_w$ 
11 Let  $s = \text{pre}(w, i)$ 
12 if  $r' \in \text{nextTrans}(\text{last}(w))$  then
13    $\text{candidates} = \{t \in \text{enabled}(s) \mid t = \text{thread}(r') \text{ or } (\exists l \in \text{dom}(w) : l > i \text{ and } l \rightarrow_w \text{task}(r') \text{ and } t = \text{thread}(r_l))\}$ 
14 else
15    $\text{candidates} = \{t \in \text{enabled}(s) \mid t = \text{thread}(r') \text{ or } (\exists l \in \text{dom}(w) : l > i \text{ and } l \rightarrow_w \text{index}(w, r') \text{ and } t = \text{thread}(r_l))\}$ 
16 end
17 if  $\text{candidates} \neq \emptyset$  then add any  $t \in \text{candidates}$  to  $\text{backtrack}(s)$  else add all  $t \in \text{enabled}(s)$  to  $\text{backtrack}(s)$ 

```

**Algorithm 4:** Algorithm BacktrackEager whose inputs are (1) a transition sequence  $w : r_1 \dots r_n$ , (2) an index  $i \in \text{dom}(w)$  and (3) a transition  $r'$  such that FindTarget failed to reorder transitions  $r_i$  and  $r'$

$e6$  contain dependent transitions. The handlers corresponding to  $e5$  and  $e6$  are not shown in Figure 10. Figure 10(b) shows a partial state space explored by various permutations of transitions in  $z$ . For economy of space, we merge prefixes of certain transition sequences and represent them by single edges. Queue state of threads  $t1$  and  $t2$  are indicated for some of the states reached on executing the post operations in various orders. The sequences of interest are labeled as  $z, z_1, z_2$  and  $z_3$  in Figure 10(b). The shaded states correspond to states explored by  $z$ . Sequence  $z$  has two pairs of *may be co-enabled* dependent transitions —  $(r_8, r_{10})$  and  $(r_9, r_{11})$ , and a pair of *may be reordered* dependent transitions in the handlers of  $e5$  and  $e6$ .

Assume that EM-DPOR initially explores sequence  $z_1$  in which the relative order of events  $e3$  and  $e4$  is reversed compared to that in  $z$ . We show how EM-DPOR eventually explores a dependence-covering sequence of  $z$ , rather  $z$  itself, when the model checking

starts with  $z_1$ . A dependence-covering sequence of  $z$  must maintain the relative ordering of all pairs of dependent transitions in  $z$  (see Definition 2.4). Clearly,  $z_1$  is not a dependence-covering sequence of  $z$  as the relative order of dependent transitions in the event handlers of  $e5$  and  $e6$  is reversed w.r.t. that in  $z$ .

When exploring  $z_1$ , Algorithm 1 invokes FindTarget to compute backtracking choices to reorder dependent transitions in the handlers of  $e6$  and  $e5$ . Step 1 identifies  $r_6$  and  $r_5$  as corresponding diverging posts and recursively invokes FindTarget to reorder  $r_6$  and  $r_5$ . In the recursive call Step 2 adds thread  $t2$  to  $\text{backtrack}(s_7)$  since  $r_6$  is executed from state  $s_7$ , and EM-DPOR eventually explores a sequence  $z_2$ . Since  $r_5 \in \text{reorderedPosts}(r_6, z_2)$ ,  $r_5$  and  $r_6$  are related by  $\rightarrow_{z_2}$ . Again,  $z_2$  is not a dependence-covering sequence of  $z$  as the relative order of dependent transitions  $r_9$  and  $r_{11}$  is reversed compared to that in  $z$ . On exploring a prefix of  $z_2$  till state  $s_{17}$  where  $r_9 = \text{next}(s_{17}, t1)$ , FindTarget

is invoked to reorder  $r_{11}$  and  $r_9$ . Step 2 of `FindTarget` computes  $candidates = \{(t1, e2)\}$ . Since  $t1$  is in  $done(s_7)$  due to sequence  $z_1$ , Step 3 is reached which computes  $pending = \{(t1, e2)\}$ . Then, `ReschedulePending` is invoked to reorder relevant blocked events with executable events at state  $s_7$ . Event  $e2$  is added to  $swapMap[t1]$  and  $(t1, e1)$  to  $worklist$  (line 2). On processing  $(t1, e1)$  in  $worklist$ , Step 3(b) in Algorithm 3 adds blocked event  $e3$  to  $swapMap[t2]$  and  $(t2, e4)$  to  $worklist$ , as  $r_5$  in  $(t2, e3)$  happens-before  $r_6$  in  $(t1, e1)$ . No task is added to  $worklist$  on processing  $(t2, e4)$ . Then, Step 3c invokes `FindTarget` to reorder posts of events  $e1$  and  $e2$  and posts of  $e4$  and  $e3$ . Reordering  $e4$  and  $e3$  allows us to explore  $z$  — our target sequence. As mentioned earlier, arbitrarily selecting a blocked event for reordering, among the set of blocked events identified by Steps 3a - 3b may not yield a dependence-covering sequence for a target sequence. For example, any sequence explored after reordering events  $e1$  and  $e2$  reverses the order of  $r_8$  and  $r_{10}$  as shown in sequence  $z_3$ , making such sequences *non* dependence-covering w.r.t.  $z$ . This example also demonstrated the necessity to capture the ordering between reordered posts. The happens-before mapping from  $r_5$  to  $r_6$  helped in identifying event  $e3$  as a relevant blocked event to be reordered with its corresponding executable event  $e1$ , leading to the exploration of a dependence-covering sequence of  $z$ .

### 3.3 Simulating DPOR (Algorithm BacktrackEager)

Call to `BacktrackEager( $w, i, r'$ )` is performed by line 13 in Algorithm 2 when Steps 2 and 3 of Algorithm 2 fail to identify backtracking choices to reorder transitions  $r$  (same as  $r_i$ ) executed at a state  $s$  and  $r'$ . This situation can arise if the model checker misses some happens-before orderings, e.g., due to limitations of the implementation. When DPOR hits such scenarios in the multi-threaded setting, it includes all the threads enabled at  $s$  as backtracking choices, initiating exploration of all interleavings rooted at  $s$  [6]. In our event-driven setting, in addition, EM-DPOR must initiate all possible reordering of events in each queue which are posted prior to reaching state  $s$ . `BacktrackEager` (Algorithm 4) achieves this.

Given a transition sequence  $w$ , an index  $i$  and a transition  $r'$ , `BacktrackEager` treats every nearest pair  $(r_j, r_k)$  of transitions with no happens-before between them as per  $\rightarrow_w$ , and posting to the same event queue as *dependent*, provided  $j, k < i$  (Algorithm 4 line 4). We consider  $r_j$  to be *nearest* to  $r_k$  if  $j < k$  and  $r_j$  has the highest index in  $w$  among all other transitions satisfying the given constraints. `BacktrackEager` then simulates the DPOR approach with this dependence relation from the initial state along  $w$  up to  $r_i$ . Note that dependence through shared objects is already considered in Algorithm 1. Lines 5–7 add backtracking choices at state  $pre(w, j)$  to reorder  $r_j$  and  $r_k$ , and mark  $r_j$  to happen before  $r_k$ . The new happens-before mapping added to  $\rightarrow_w$  induces additional transitive and FIFO mappings to be added to  $\rightarrow_w$  (see Definition 3.1). We call this the *extended*  $\rightarrow_w$ . If  $r_i$  now has a happens-before ordering with  $r'$  due to extended  $\rightarrow_w$ , then `BacktrackEager` returns (line 8), because  $r_i$  and  $r'$  have got related by happens-before by considering a pair of `post` operations  $(r_j, r_k)$  as dependent. Thus,  $r_i$  and  $r'$  will get reordered when  $r_j$  and  $r_k$  get reordered on exploring backtracking choices added by line 6. Otherwise, the algorithm iterates until  $r_i$  is reached, and computes backtracking choices to reorder  $r_i$  and  $r'$  similar to DPOR (lines 11–17) using the extended  $\rightarrow_w$ . Below is an example illustrating the working of `BacktrackEager`.

**EXAMPLE 3.6.** Consider an implementation of EM-DPOR which does not track happens-before between a `fork` operation and the initialization of the spawned thread. Assume exploring a sequence  $w$  given in Figure 3 with such an implementation of EM-DPOR. On reaching state  $s_5$  (Figure 4) `Explore` invokes `FindTarget` to

Table 1: Statistics on execution traces from Android applications

| Application           | Trace length | Threads | Events | Memory locations |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------|--------|------------------|
| Remind Me             | 444          | 4       | 9      | 89               |
| My Tracks             | 453          | 10      | 9      | 108              |
| Music Player          | 465          | 6       | 24     | 68               |
| Character Recognition | 485          | 4       | 22     | 40               |
| Aard Dictionary       | 600          | 5       | 30     | 30               |

reorder dependent transitions  $r_3$  and  $r_6$ . As thread  $t4$  executing  $r_6$  is not enabled at  $s_2$  and missing happens-before mapping between  $r_4$  and  $r_5$  causes  $candidates$  computed on line 4 of Algorithm 2 to be empty set. Set  $pending$  is also empty as it is a subset of  $candidates$ . This causes the control flow of `FindTarget` to reach Step 4 invoking `BacktrackEager( $r_1 \dots r_5, 3, r_6$ )`. Then, lines 4–6 in Algorithm 4 pick transitions  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  as nearest co-enabled posts posting  $e1$  and  $e2$  to thread  $t1$ , and add  $t3$  executing  $r_2$  to  $backtrack(s_0)$  as  $r_1$  is explored at  $s_0$  in  $w$ . On backtracking to  $s_0$ , EM-DPOR explores a run where events  $e1$  and  $e2$  are reordered aiding the reordering of  $r_3$  and  $r_6$  as shown in Figure 4.

### 3.4 Formal Guarantees

The following theorem proved in Appendix C states that EM-DPOR explores dependence-covering sets at visited states.

**Theorem 3.7.** In a finite and acyclic state space  $S_G$ , whenever `Explore` (Algorithm 1) backtracks from a state  $s$  to a state prior to  $s$  in the search stack, EM-DPOR has explored a dependence-covering sequence for any sequence  $w$  in  $S_G$  from  $s$ , i.e., the set of transitions explored from a state  $s$  is a dependence-covering set in  $s$ .

## 4. Implementation and Evaluation

This section describes a vector clock based implementation of EM-DPOR on a prototype framework called EM-Explorer, and an evaluation of this implementation against DPOR [6].

**Vector clock based implementation.** Similar to DPOR, we have implemented our algorithm using a vector clocks datastructure [15]. In a multi-threaded setting where all the operations executed on the same thread are totally ordered, a clock is assigned to each thread and the components of a vector clock correspond to clock values of the threads of the program. In an event-driven program, the operations from different handlers on the same thread need not be totally ordered and hence, we assign a clock to each task in the program. All the operations on vector clocks described in [6] are lifted in a straightforward manner to task-based vector clocks. The treatment of FIFO closure (Definition 3.1 rule (2)) requires a special design explained below.

On executing `post( $\_, e, t$ )`, a task with vector clock  $V_1$  increments its component  $V_1(t, e)$  making this component non-zero, and initializes vector clock, say  $V_2$ , of task  $(t, e)$  with same values as that in  $V_1$ . After initialization  $V_2$  remains unmodified till event  $e$  is dequeued. When dequeuing event  $e$  we check the value of each component corresponding to tasks on thread  $t$  in vector clock  $V_2$ , and if it is non-zero we update  $V_2$  to join of  $V_2$  and the task's vector clock. A non-zero component value for a task  $(t, e')$  in  $(t, e)$ 's vector clock  $V_2$  indicates that `post( $\_, e', t$ )` happens-before `post( $\_, e, t$ )`, and thus FIFO rule in Definition 3.1 is applicable.

**EM-Explorer framework.** Building a full-fledged model checker for Android applications is a challenge in itself but is not the focus of this work. Tools such as JPF-Android [28] and AsyncDroid [18] take promising steps in this direction. However, presently they either explore only a limited number of sources of non-determinism [18] or require a lot of framework libraries to be modeled [27, 28]. We have therefore built a prototype exploration framework called EM-

Table 2: Statistics on model checking runs using different POR techniques

| Application           | DPOR     |             |          | EM-DPOR |             |          |
|-----------------------|----------|-------------|----------|---------|-------------|----------|
|                       | Traces   | Transitions | Time     | Traces  | Transitions | Time     |
| Remind Me             | 24       | 1864        | 0.18s    | 3       | 875         | 0.05s    |
| My Tracks             | 1610684* | 113299092*  | 4h*      | 405013  | 26745327    | 101m 30s |
| Music Player          | 1508413* | 93254810*   | 4h*      | 266     | 34333       | 4.15s    |
| Character Recognition | 1284788  | 67062526    | 199m 28s | 756     | 39422       | 6.58s    |
| Aard Dictionary       | 359961*  | 14397143*   | 4h*      | 14      | 4772        | 1.4s     |

Explorer, which emulates the semantics of visible operations like `post`, `read`, `acquire` and so on.

Our framework takes an execution trace generated by an automated testing and race detection tool for Android applications, called DroidRacer [14], as input. Since DroidRacer runs on real-world applications, we can experiment on real concurrency behaviors seen in Android applications and evaluate different POR techniques on them. DroidRacer records all concurrency relevant operations and memory reads and writes. EM-Explorer *emulates* such a trace based on their operational semantics and explores all interleavings of the given execution trace permitted by the semantics. Android permits user and system-generated events apart from program generated events. EM-Explorer only explores the non-determinism between program and system generated events while keeping the order of user events fixed. This is analogous to model checking w.r.t. a fixed data input. EM-Explorer does not track variable values and is incapable of evaluating conditionals on a different interleaving of the trace.

Android supports different types of component classes, *e.g.*, Activity class for user interface, and enforces a happens-before ordering between handlers of lifecycle events of component classes. EM-Explorer seeds the happens-before relation for such events in each trace before starting the model checking, to avoid exploring invalid interleavings of lifecycle events. We recursively remove empty handlers (handlers with no visible operations) from recorded traces before model checking.

#### 4.1 Experimental Evaluation

We evaluate the performance of EM-DPOR which computes dependence-covering sets with DPOR which computes persistent sets, when model checking execution traces of Android applications. DPOR uses the dependence relation in which `posts` are considered dependent. Both the algorithms are implemented in the EM-Explorer framework described in Section 4 and use vector clocks.

We evaluated these two POR techniques on execution traces generated by DroidRacer on 5 Android applications obtained from the Google Play Store<sup>3</sup>. Table 1 presents statistics like trace length (the number of *visible* operations), and the number of threads, events and (shared) memory locations in an execution trace for each of these applications. We only report the threads created by the application, and the number of events excluding events with empty handlers.

We analyzed each of the traces described in Table 1 using both the POR techniques. Table 2 gives the number of interleavings (listed as *Traces*) and distinct transitions explored by DPOR and EM-DPOR. It also gives the time taken for exploring the reduced state space for each execution trace. If a model checking run did not terminate within 4 hours, we force-kill it and report the statistics for 4 hours. The statistics for force-killed runs are marked with \* in Table 2. Since EM-Explorer does not track variable values, it cannot prune executions that are infeasible due to conditional sequential execution. However, both DPOR and EM-DPOR are implemented on top of EM-Explorer and therefore operate on the same set of interleavings. The difference in their performance thus arises from the different POR strategies.

In our experiments, DPOR’s model checking run terminated only on two execution traces among the five, whereas, EM-DPOR terminated on all of them. Except for one case, EM-DPOR finished state space exploration within a few seconds. As can be seen from Table 2, DPOR explores a much larger number of interleavings and transitions, often *orders of magnitude* larger compared to EM-DPOR. While this is a small evaluation, it does show that significant reduction can be achieved for real-world event-driven multi-threaded programs by avoiding unnecessary reordering of events.

*Performance.* Both the techniques used about the same memory and the maximum peak memory consumed by EM-DPOR across all traces, as reported by Valgrind, was less than 50MB. The experiments were performed on a machine with Intel Core i5 3.2GHz CPU with 4GB RAM, and running Ubuntu 12.04 OS.

## 5. Conclusions and Future Work

The event-driven multi-threaded style of programming concurrent applications is becoming increasingly popular. We considered the problem of POR-based efficient stateless model checking for this concurrency model. The key insight of our work is that more reduction is achievable by treating operations that post events to the same thread as independent and only reordering them if necessary.

Towards this, we presented new formulations of dependence-covering sequences and sets such that exploring only dependence-covering sets suffices to provide certain formal guarantees. We also presented EM-DPOR—a dynamic algorithm to perform POR by computing dependence-covering sets for event-driven multi-threaded programs. Our experiments provide empirical evidence that EM-DPOR explores orders of magnitude fewer transitions compared to DPOR for event-driven multi-threaded programs. In future, we plan to develop further optimizations and a practical tool to model check these programs. Also, we aim to achieve better reductions by defining a notion of sleep sets suitable for this concurrency model and combining it with dependence-covering sets.

<sup>3</sup><https://play.google.com/store/apps>

## References

- [1] P. Abdulla, S. Aronis, B. Jonsson, and K. Sagonas. Optimal Dynamic Partial Order Reduction. In *POPL*, pages 373–384. ACM, 2014.
- [2] P. A. Abdulla, S. Aronis, M. F. Atig, B. Jonsson, C. Leonardsson, and K. F. Sagonas. Stateless model checking for TSO and PSO. In *TACAS*, volume 9035 of *LNCS*, pages 353–367. Springer, 2015. ISBN 978-3-662-46680-3.
- [3] P. Bielik, V. Raychev, and M. T. Vechev. Scalable race detection for android applications. In *OOPSLA*, pages 332–348. ACM, 2015.
- [4] E. M. Clarke, O. Grumberg, M. Minea, and D. Peled. State space reduction using partial order techniques. *STTT*, 2(3):279–287, 1999.
- [5] M. Emmi, A. Lal, and S. Qadeer. Asynchronous programs with prioritized task-buffers. In *SIGSOFT FSE*, pages 48:1–48:11. ACM, 2012.
- [6] C. Flanagan and P. Godefroid. Dynamic Partial-Order Reduction for Model Checking Software. In *POPL*, pages 110–121. ACM, 2005.
- [7] P. Ganty and R. Majumdar. Algorithmic verification of asynchronous programs. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 34(1):6:1–6:48, 2012. ISSN 0164-0925.
- [8] P. Godefroid. *Partial-Order Methods for the Verification of Concurrent Systems - An Approach to the State-Explosion Problem*, volume 1032 of *LNCS*. 1996.
- [9] P. Godefroid. Model Checking for Programming Languages using Verisort. In *POPL*, pages 174–186. ACM Press, 1997.
- [10] P. Godefroid. Software model checking: The verisort approach. *Formal Methods in System Design*, 26(2):77–101, 2005.
- [11] G. Holzmann. *The Spin Model Checker: Primer and Reference Manual*. Addison-Wesley, 2004.
- [12] C.-H. Hsiao, J. Yu, S. Narayanasamy, Z. Kong, C. L. Pereira, G. A. Pokam, P. M. Chen, and J. Flinn. Race Detection for Event-driven Mobile Applications. In *PLDI*, pages 326–336. ACM, 2014.
- [13] C. S. Jensen, A. Møller, V. Raychev, D. Dimitrov, and M. T. Vechev. Stateless model checking of event-driven applications. In *OOPSLA*, pages 57–73. ACM, 2015.
- [14] P. Maiya, A. Kanade, and R. Majumdar. Race detection for Android applications. In *PLDI*, pages 316–325. ACM, 2014.
- [15] F. Mattern. Virtual time and global states of distributed systems. *Parallel and Distributed Algorithms*, 1(23):215–226, 1989.
- [16] A. W. Mazurkiewicz. Trace theory. In *Advances in Petri Nets 1986*, volume 255 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 279–324. Springer, 1986.
- [17] Z. Mednieks, L. Dornin, G. B. Meike, and M. Nakamura. *Programming Android*. O'Reilly Media, Inc., 2012.
- [18] B. K. Ozkan, M. Emmi, and S. Tasiran. Systematic asynchrony bug exploration for android apps. In *CAV*, volume 9206 of *LNCS*, pages 455–461. Springer, 2015. ISBN 978-3-319-21689-8.
- [19] R. Palmer, G. Gopalakrishnan, and R. M. Kirby. Semantics Driven Dynamic Partial-order Reduction of MPI-based Parallel Programs. In *PADTAD*, pages 43–53. ACM, 2007.
- [20] D. Peled. All from one, one for all: on model checking using representatives. In *CAV*, pages 409–423. Springer, 1993.
- [21] C. Rodríguez, M. Sousa, S. Sharma, and D. Kroening. Unfolding-based partial order reduction. In *CONCUR*, volume 42 of *LIPICs*, pages 456–469. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2015. ISBN 978-3-939897-91-0.
- [22] K. Sen and G. Agha. Automated Systematic Testing of Open Distributed Programs. In *FASE*, pages 339–356. Springer-Verlag, 2006.
- [23] K. Sen and M. Viswanathan. Model checking multithreaded programs with asynchronous atomic methods. In *CAV*, volume 4144 of *LNCS*, pages 300–314. Springer, 2006.
- [24] S. Tasharofi, R. K. Karmani, S. Lauterburg, A. Legay, D. Marinov, and G. Agha. TransDPOR: A Novel Dynamic Partial-order Reduction Technique for Testing Actor Programs. *FMOODS’12/FORTE’12*, pages 219–234. Springer-Verlag, 2012.
- [25] S. S. Vakkalanka, G. Gopalakrishnan, and R. M. Kirby. Dynamic Verification of MPI Programs with Reductions in Presence of Split Operations and Relaxed Orderings. In *CAV*, pages 66–79. Springer, 2008.
- [26] A. Valmari. Stubborn Sets for Reduced State Space Generation. In *Advances in Petri Nets 1990*, pages 491–515. Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [27] H. van der Merwe. Verification of Android Applications. In *ICSE*, volume 2, pages 931–934. IEEE, 2015.
- [28] H. van der Merwe, B. van der Merwe, and W. Visser. Verifying android applications using Java PathFinder. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, 37(6):1–5, 2012.
- [29] N. Zhang, M. Kusano, and C. Wang. Dynamic partial order reduction for relaxed memory models. In *PLDI*, pages 250–259. ACM, 2015. ISBN 978-1-4503-3468-6.

## A. Proofs for Detection of Deadlock Cycles and Assertion Violations in the Reduced State Space

### A.1 Deadlock Cycles

In the following discussion, let  $w$  be a transition sequence from a state  $s$  in  $S_G$  to reach a deadlock cycle  $\langle DC, \rho \rangle$ . Let  $u$  be a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  starting from  $s$ . Further,  $R_w$  and  $R_u$  be the sets of transitions executed in  $w$  and  $u$  respectively, and  $s_n$  and  $s'_m$  be the last states reached by  $w$  and  $u$  respectively.

**Lemma A.1.** Let  $s_i$  be a state reached by a prefix of  $w$  where a transition  $b \in DC$  is blocked and not enabled later in  $w$ . Then, there exists a prefix of  $u$  which reaches a state  $s'_j$  where  $b$  is blocked and not enabled later in  $u$ .

*Proof.* Let  $R_b \subseteq R_w$  denote the transitions which have a direct dependence with  $b$  or a dependence with some other transition which directly or transitively has a dependence with  $b$ . By definition (see Definition 2.4),  $R_w \subseteq R_u$  and hence,  $R_b \subseteq R_u$ . Further, the relative ordering of dependent transitions in  $R_b$  is maintained in  $u$ . Let  $s'_j$  be the state reached after executing all transitions in  $R_b$  in  $u$ . Since  $b \in \text{nextTrans}(s_n)$ , there can be a transition  $r'_k$  in  $u$  such that  $r'_k \notin R_w$  and  $r'_k$  is dependent with  $b$ , in particular,  $r'_k$  enables  $b$ . Since  $u$  is a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$ ,  $r'_k$  exists only if  $w$  can be extended so that  $r'_k$  executes before  $b$ . By the definition of deadlock cycle, this is not possible. Hence, the transition  $b$  will be blocked at  $s'_j$  and there is no transition in  $u$  which enables  $b$  after  $s'_j$ .  $\square$

**Lemma A.2.** The pair  $\langle DC, \rho \rangle$  is a deadlock cycle at  $s'_m$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma A.1, for any  $b \in DC$ , there exists a state  $s'_j$  reachable from  $s$  by some prefix of  $u$  such that  $b$  is blocked at  $s'_j$  and not enabled later in  $u$ . Thus, all the transitions in  $DC$  are blocked at  $s'_m$ .

Let  $DC$  contain  $k$  transitions and  $b = \rho(a)$  for some  $a \in [1, k]$ . Let  $t$  be the thread blocked on the transition  $b' = \rho(a + 1)$  at  $s_n$  where  $k + 1$  is taken to be 1. In  $w$ , let  $r_i$  be the transition of  $t$  that blocks  $b$  after which it is never enabled. Clearly,  $r_i \in R_b$  for the set  $R_b$  defined in the proof of Lemma A.1. Since the state  $s'_j$  is reached in  $u$  once all the transitions in  $R_b$  are executed and in the same relative order between themselves,  $r_i$  blocks  $b$  before or at  $s'_j$  in  $u$ . Since  $b$  remains blocked from  $s'_j$  onwards (Lemma A.1), there is no other transition in  $u$  that can enable  $b$ . By Lemma A.1, the thread  $t$  itself subsequently blocks on  $b' \in DC$  in  $u$ . Thus,  $\langle DC, \rho \rangle$  is also a deadlock cycle at  $s'_m$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.8.1. [Part of Theorem 2.8]** Let  $S_R$  be a dependence-covering state space of an event-driven multi-threaded program  $A$

with a finite and acyclic state space  $\mathcal{S}_G$ . Then, all deadlock cycles in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  are reachable in  $\mathcal{S}_R$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\langle DC, \rho \rangle$  be a deadlock cycle at a state  $d$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ , reachable from  $s_{init}$ . Let  $s$  be a state which is common to both  $\mathcal{S}_G$  and  $\mathcal{S}_R$  such that there exists a transition sequence  $w$  from  $s$  to  $d$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ . In the least,  $s_{init}$  is such a state.

Let  $L$  be a dependence-covering set at  $s$ . By definition (see Definition 2.5), there exists a transition sequence  $u$  from  $s$ , starting with a transition  $r \in L$  such that  $u$  is a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$ . By Lemma A.2,  $u$  eventually reaches the deadlock cycle  $\langle DC, \rho \rangle$ . Let  $s' = r(s)$ . Since  $r \in L$ ,  $s'$  is in  $\mathcal{S}_R$ . If  $u = r.u'$  then  $u'$  is a transition sequence from  $s'$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  to a state with deadlock cycle  $\langle DC, \rho \rangle$ . There exists a dependence-covering sequence for  $u'$  from  $s'$  in  $\mathcal{S}_R$ . With a similar argument, there exists a successor state  $s''$  of  $s'$  in  $\mathcal{S}_R$  from which the same deadlock cycle can be reached and so on. Since the state space is finite and acyclic, eventually a state  $d'$  is reached in  $\mathcal{S}_R$  where  $\langle DC, \rho \rangle$  is a deadlock cycle.  $\square$

A dependence-covering state space only preserves all the deadlock cycles and not deadlock states present in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ . Suppose  $w$  is a transition sequence in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  reaching a deadlock state  $d$ . Let  $u$  be a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$ . Since  $u$  may contain some transitions not in  $w$  (Definition 2.4) and those may modify some shared objects,  $u$  may reach another state  $d'$  with the same deadlock cycle as in  $d$ . But  $d$  and  $d'$  may not be the same. Note that exploration of the dependence-covering state space does detect the set of transitions involved in *each* deadlock in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ .

## A.2 Assertion Violations

**Theorem 2.8.2.** [Part of Theorem 2.8] Let  $\mathcal{S}_R$  be a dependence-covering state space of an event-driven multi-threaded program  $A$  with a finite and acyclic state space  $\mathcal{S}_G$ . If there exists a state  $v$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  which violates an assertion  $\alpha$  defined over local variables then there exists a state  $v'$  in  $\mathcal{S}_R$  which violates  $\alpha$ .

*Proof.* The state  $v$  is reachable from the initial state  $s_{init}$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ . Let  $s$  be a state which is common to both  $\mathcal{S}_G$  and  $\mathcal{S}_R$  such that there exists a transition sequence  $w$  from  $s$  to  $v$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ . In the least,  $s_{init}$  is such a state.

Let  $L$  be a dependence-covering set at  $s$ . By definition (see Definition 2.5), there exists a transition sequence  $u$  from  $s$ , starting with a transition  $r \in L$  such that  $u$  is a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$ . Let  $R_w$  and  $R_u$  be the sets of transitions executed in  $w$  and  $u$  respectively. Let  $R_\alpha \subseteq R_w$  denote the set of transitions which have a direct dependence with  $\alpha$  or a dependence with some other transition which directly or transitively has a dependence with  $\alpha$ . By definition (see Definition 2.4),  $R_w \subseteq R_u$  and hence,  $R_\alpha \subseteq R_u$ . Further, the relative ordering of dependent transitions in  $R_\alpha$  is maintained in  $u$ . Let  $v'$  be the state reached after executing all transitions in  $R_\alpha$  in  $u$ . Since  $\alpha$  is an assertion on local variables, no new transition  $r'_k \in R_u$  i.e.,  $r'_k \in R_u \setminus R_w$  can have a dependence with  $\alpha$ . Thus state  $v'$  violates the assertion  $\alpha$ .

Let  $s' = r(s)$ . Since  $r \in L$ ,  $s'$  is in  $\mathcal{S}_R$ . If  $u = r.u'$  then  $u'$  is a transition sequence from  $s'$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  to a state which violates  $\alpha$ . With a similar argument, there exists a successor state  $s''$  of  $s'$  in  $\mathcal{S}_R$  from which a state which violates  $\alpha$  is reachable and so on. Since the state space is finite and acyclic, eventually a state is reached in  $\mathcal{S}_R$  which violates  $\alpha$ .  $\square$

## B. Relation between Persistent Sets and Dependence-covering Sets

**Theorem B.1.** If  $P$  is a persistent set in a state  $s \in \mathcal{S}_G$  according to the standard dependence relation which considers posts to

the same event queue to be dependent, then  $P$  is a dependence-covering set in  $s$  according to the dependence relation of Definition 2.2.

*Proof.* Let  $w : r_1.r_2 \dots r_n$  be any transition sequence in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  from a state  $s$ . As  $w$  is a dependence-covering sequence of itself, if  $r_1 \in P$  then  $P$  is also a dependence-covering set in  $s$ .

If  $r_1 \notin P$  then by Lemma 6.8 in [8] we can infer that either (a) there exists a sequence  $w' \in [w]$  (where  $[w]$  is the Mazurkiewicz trace of  $w$ ) such that the first transition in  $w'$ , say  $w'_1$ , is in the persistent set  $P$ , or (b) all the transitions in  $P$  are independent with all the transitions in  $w$ .

**Case (a):** We show that  $w'$  is a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  even according to dependence relation of Definition 2.2. Since  $w' \in [w]$ , the relative ordering of each pair of dependent transitions in  $w'$  is the same as that in  $w$ . The only difference between the dependence relation of Definition 2.2 and the standard dependence relation resulting in Mazurkiewicz traces is that, Definition 2.2 considers posts to be independent and does not totally order transitions executed by different event handlers on the same thread. However, if interfering (non-post) transitions are executed on two different threads, then both these dependence relations identify such pairs to be dependent. Since posts are considered dependent as per the dependence relation resulting in  $[w]$ , the relative ordering of all posts in  $w'$  posting to the same event queue is consistent with that in  $w$ . As a result, the relative ordering of operations across event handlers executed on the same thread is the same in both  $w'$  and  $w$ . Thus, the relative orderings of all dependent transitions in  $w$  are preserved in  $w'$  even according to Definition 2.2. Additionally,  $R_w = R_{w'}$  because of the property of Mazurkiewicz trace. Thus,  $w'$  is a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  such that  $w'_1 \in P$  (assumption of this case). Therefore,  $P$  is a dependence-covering set in  $s$  as per Definition 2.5.

**Case (b):** Consider a state  $s' = r(s)$  such that  $r \in P$ . As per the assumptions of this case,  $r$  is independent with all the transitions in  $w$  as per the standard dependence relation which considers posts to the same queue dependent. Then, sequence  $w$  is enabled at  $s'$  making  $r.w$  a valid sequence in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ . If any transition  $r_i$  in  $w$  has a post operation, then  $r$  cannot be a transition posting to the same event queue as  $r_i$ . Otherwise,  $r_i$  would be dependent with  $r$ , contradicting the assumption of this case. Also, if  $r$  is executed on a thread  $t$  then, no transition in  $w$  is executed on thread  $t$ , because  $next(s, t)$  is unique. A pair of transitions from different threads considered independent by the standard dependence relation, are considered independent even by Definition 2.2 (see condition 2 of the definition). Hence,  $r.w$  is a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  in conjunction with dependence relation of Definition 2.2. Thus,  $P$  is a dependence-covering set in  $s$ .  $\square$

## C. Proofs to Show that EM-DPOR Computes Dependence-covering Sets

Algorithm `Explore` (Algorithm 1) performs a depth first traversal of the state space. We want to prove that whenever `Explore` backtracks from a state  $s$  to a prior state in the search stack, it must have explored a dependence-covering sequence for any sequence  $w$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  from state  $s$ . We equivalently prove that EM-DPOR explores a dependence-covering set at each visited state  $s$ .

We organize this section as follows. Section C.1 gives the proof strategy for the Theorem 3.7. Section C.2 proves the lemmas related to the cases introduced in the proof strategy, and Section C.3 presents the main proof. The variables and notation introduced in Section C.1 will be used in the rest of this section.

In the rest of the section, *happens-before* relation ( $\rightarrow_w$ ) used in the context of a transition sequence  $w$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  which is not assumed to be explored by EM-DPOR is defined as follows:

**Definition C.1.** The *happens-before* relation  $\rightarrow_w$  for a transition sequence  $w : r_1.r_2 \dots r_n$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  is the smallest relation on  $dom(w)$  such that the following conditions hold:

1. If  $i < j$  and  $r_i$  is dependent with  $r_j$  then  $i \rightarrow_w j$ .
2. If  $r_i$  and  $r_j$  are transitions posting events  $e$  and  $e'$  respectively to the same thread, such that  $i \rightarrow_w j$  and the handler of  $e$  has finished and that of  $e'$  has started in  $w$ , then  $getEnd(w, e) \rightarrow_w getBegin(w, e')$ .
3.  $\rightarrow_w$  is transitively closed.

While the above happens-before relation is similar to that defined in Definition 3.1, it does not reason about reordered posts in  $w$ , as we do not assume  $w$  to be explored by EM-DPOR which makes the notion of reordered posts irrelevant in the context of  $w$ . Hence, the above happens-before relation can be derived for a transition sequence in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  without any prior information and purely with the help of dependence relation on  $\mathcal{S}_G$ . However, if  $w$  is assumed to be explored by EM-DPOR then happens-before relation ( $\rightarrow_w$ ) referred in its context is the one defined in Definition 3.1. We use analogous definition even for  $\sim_w$  depending on whether  $w$  is explored or not by EM-DPOR.

## C.1 Proof Strategy and Notation

### C.1.1 Inductive Reasoning

The proof is by induction on the order in which states visited by `Explore` (Algorithm 1) are backtracked. This is similar to the inductive strategy used to prove Theorem 1 in [6], which states that DPOR algorithm computes persistent sets at each explored state. However, we cannot directly borrow the structure of DPOR's proof, as we additionally need to consider the effect of event-driven semantics and reason about the recursive nature of `FindTarget` (Algorithm 2).

Let  $S$  be a sequence explored by Algorithm `Explore` of EM-DPOR, starting from an initial state  $s_{init} \in \mathcal{S}_G$ . Let  $s = last(S)$ , and  $L = \{next(s, t) \mid t \in backtrack(s)\}$  where  $backtrack(s)$  is the backtracking set computed by EM-DPOR before backtracking to a state prior to  $s$  in the search stack  $S$ . Assume  $\mathcal{S}_R \subseteq \mathcal{S}_G$  to be the state space explored by EM-DPOR starting from state  $s_{init}$ . State  $s$  is in  $\mathcal{S}_R$  as sequence  $S$  is explored by Algorithm 1.

**Claim C1.** The EM-DPOR algorithm explores a dependence-covering sequence for every transition sequence  $w$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  from a state  $s$  reached by `Explore`( $S$ ).

**Induction Hypothesis H1.** Assume that for every transition sequence from a state reached on each recursive call `Explore`( $S.r$ ), for all  $r \in L$ , the algorithm explores a corresponding dependence-covering sequence.

The base case of the induction based proof of Claim C1 which captures the essence of Theorem 3.7 stated in Section 3, will be proved in Section C.3. The strategy for the induction step is presented below.

**Induction Step.** We prove that for any sequence  $w : s \xrightarrow{r_1} s_1 \xrightarrow{r_2} s_2 \dots \xrightarrow{r_n} s_n$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ , `Explore`( $S$ ) explores a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  from state  $s$ . Here,  $s' \xrightarrow{r'} s''$  means  $s'' = r'(s')$ .

If  $r_1 \in L$  then, the algorithm explores a dependence-covering sequence  $u$  of  $r_2 \dots r_n$  from state  $s_1$  by induction hypothesis H1, making  $r_1.u$  a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  from state  $s$ . Assume  $r_1 \notin L$  henceforth. We also assume that  $w$  has no

dependence-covering sequence starting with any transition in  $L$  from state  $s$ .

We prove the inductive case by doing an exhaustive case analysis of the contents of set  $L$ . Set  $L$  exhibits one of the following five cases.

- A.  $\exists p \in L$  such that  $p$  is a non-post transition and  $p$  is independent with all the transitions in  $w$ .
- B.  $L$  contains a non-empty subset of non-post transitions such that all the non-post transitions in  $L$  are dependent with some transition in  $w$ , and no transition in  $L$  is in  $w$ .
- C.  $L$  contains a non-empty subset of non-post transitions such that all the non-post transitions in  $L$  are dependent with some transition in  $w$ , and the first transition in  $w$  from  $L$  is a non-post transition.
- D.  $L$  contains only post operations and no transition in  $L$  is in  $w$ .
- E. The first transition in  $w$  from  $L$  is a post operation. In this case if  $L$  contains non-post transitions we assume all of them to be dependent with some transition in  $w$ . Note that the presence of non-post transitions in  $L$  does not affect the proof in this case.

Section C.2 presents lemmas which prove the induction step with respect to each of the five cases above. Lemma for case A is proved by deriving contradiction to our assumption on non-existence of a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  starting with any transition in  $L$  from  $s$ . Lemmas for cases B, C, D and E are proved by deriving contradictions to the assumptions made on the contents of  $L$ , when we assume non-existence of a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  starting with any transition in  $L$  from  $s$ . This in turn proves the existence of a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  in  $\mathcal{S}_R$  from state  $s$ .

### C.1.2 Common Construction for Cases B, C, D and E

As shown in Figure 11 we construct a transition sequence  $z : s \xrightarrow{r'_1} s'_1 \xrightarrow{r'_2} s'_2 \dots \xrightarrow{r'_m} s'_m$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ , such that (a)  $r'_1 \in L$  and (b)  $\exists r \in nextTrans(s'_m)$  where  $r$  is a transition in  $w$ , say  $r_\varpi = r$  for  $1 \leq \varpi \leq n$  in  $w$ , and  $r$  is dependent with a transition  $r'_i$  in  $z$  such that  $r'_i$  is the nearest may be co-enabled or may be reordered transition with no happens-before with respect to  $r$ . Additionally,  $r'_i$  may or may not be executed in  $w$ . If  $r'_i$  is executed in  $w$  then  $index(w, r) < index(w, r'_i)$ . We use such a sequence  $z$  in our proof arguments, provided  $z$  is valid in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ . We reason about the validity of  $z$  in each of cases B, C, D and E separately.

Figure 11 pictorially depicts some of the key states, transitions, sequences and function calls required when reasoning about cases B, C, D and E. Any other properties of  $r'_i$  specific to the case B, C, D or E considered, will be presented in Section C.2. Let  $Z = z.z'.r$  where  $z'$  is the shortest sequence in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  which enables  $r$ . If there exists no such  $z'$  then  $Z = z$ . Note that  $z' = \epsilon$  if  $thread(r) \in enabled(s'_m)$ . Let  $v$  be a suffix of  $Z$  from state  $s'_1$  i.e.,  $v = r'_2.r'_3 \dots r'_m.z'.r$  if  $Z = z.z'.r$  or  $v = r'_2.r'_3 \dots r'_m$  if  $Z = z$ . Since  $s \in \mathcal{S}_R$  and  $r'_1 \in L$ , state  $s'_1 = r'_1(s)$  is in  $\mathcal{S}_R$ . Then by induction hypothesis H1, EM-DPOR explores a dependence-covering sequence  $u$  of  $v$  from  $s'_1$ . Since  $r'_1 \in L$  algorithm explores  $r'_1.u$ . Clearly,  $r'_1.u$  is a dependence-covering sequence of  $Z = r'_1.v$  from state  $s$ .

Let  $\delta_\gamma \in \mathcal{S}_R$  be the state reached by  $S.r'_1.\gamma$  where  $\gamma$  is a prefix of  $u$  such that  $r'_i$  is a transition in  $r'_1.\gamma$ , and transition  $r$  dependent with  $r'_i$  is in  $nextTrans(\delta_\gamma)$ . Due to the characteristics of  $r'_i$  and  $r$  described in constraint (b) on sequence  $z$ , and  $r'_1.u$  being a dependence-covering sequence of  $Z$  whose prefix is  $z$ , `Explore`( $S.r'_1.\gamma$ ) invokes `FindTarget`( $S.r'_1.\gamma, r'_i, r$ ) (line 3 in Algorithm 1). With this being a common scenario for cases B, C, D



1.  $\text{candidates} \neq \emptyset$  Then  $\text{threadSet}(\text{candidates}) \cap \text{backtrack}(s)$  is not an empty set. This is due to line 8 in Algorithm 2, and even if  $\text{threadSet}(\text{candidates}) \subseteq \text{done}(s)$ ,  $\text{done}(s) \subseteq \text{backtrack}(s)$  at any point of execution of the algorithm. This contradicts the assumption that set  $L$  has no transition from sequence  $w$ .

2.  $\text{candidates} = \emptyset$  Then set  $\text{pending}$  computed at line 9 in Algorithm 2 is an empty set as  $\text{pending} \subseteq \text{candidates}$ . This results in a call to  $\text{BacktrackEager}(S.r'_1.\gamma, |S| + 1, r)$  on line 13. Note that  $\text{index}(S.r'_1.\gamma, r'_1) = |S| + 1$ .

$\text{BacktrackEager}(S.r'_1.\gamma, |S| + 1, r)$  (Algorithm 4) orders each pair of co-enabled post transitions in  $S$  posting events to the same destination thread, and closes the happens-before relation  $\rightarrow_{S.r'_1.\gamma}$  with FIFO and transitivity due to newly added post to post mappings. We refer to the modified happens-before relation as *extended* happens-before relation. We show that the extended happens-before relation does not order  $r'_1$  and  $r$  i.e.,  $i \not\rightarrow_{S.r'_1.\gamma} \text{task}(r)$  where  $i = |S| + 1$ . This is because, sequence  $S.w$  executes  $r$  and not  $r'_1$  whereas, sequence  $S.r'_1.\gamma$  executes  $r'_1$  and not  $r$ . Hence with a common prefix  $S$ , sequences  $S.w$  and  $S.r'_1.\gamma$  explore both the ordering between  $r$  and  $r'_1$ . Thus the order of post operations in  $S$  does not determine the order of  $r'_1$  and  $r$ . However  $\text{BacktrackEager}$  only orders post operations in  $S$  and their respective handlers in  $S.r'_1.\gamma$ .

Since  $i \not\rightarrow_{S.r'_1.\gamma} \text{task}(r)$ , Algorithm 4 does not return via line 8 and proceeds to compute set  $\text{candidates}_1$  on line 13 using extended happens-before relation. Due to FIFO the handlers posted to the same thread execute in the order in which they are posted. Since  $S$  is a prefix of both  $S.w$  and  $S.r'_1.\gamma$  the relative execution order of event handlers in  $w$  and  $r'_1.\gamma$  whose events are posted in  $S$  is the same.  $\text{BacktrackEager}$  only augments happens-before mappings between transitions of handlers posted in  $S$ . Thus any new happens-before mappings in the extended happens-before relation, between a transition  $p$  in  $r'_1.\gamma$  and  $r$  is such that  $p$  is a transition in  $w$ , and  $\text{index}(S.w, p) < \text{index}(S.w, r)$ . This along with our earlier reasoning on the dependence-covering property of  $S.r'_1.u$  proves that  $\text{candidates}_1$  only contains threads whose enabled transitions at  $s$  are executed in sequence  $w$ . If  $\text{candidates}_1 \neq \emptyset$  then line 17 of Algorithm 4 adds a thread from  $\text{candidates}_1$  to  $\text{backtrack}(s)$ . This contradicts the assumption that sequence  $w$  has no transition from  $L$ . If  $\text{candidates}_1 = \emptyset$ , then  $\text{backtrack}(s) = \text{enabled}(s)$  (line 17). Then,  $\text{thread}(r_1) \in \text{backtrack}(s)$  which implies  $r_1 \in L$ . Transition  $r_1$  being the first transition in  $w$  contradicts the assumption that sequence  $w$  has no transition from set  $L$ .  $\square$

### C.2.3 Case C

Case C states that  $L$  contains a non-empty subset of non-post transitions such that all the non-post transitions in  $L$  are dependent with some transition in  $w$ , and the first transition in  $w$  from  $L$  is a non-post transition. To suit the case under consideration, we refine the construction of sequence  $z$  depicted in Figure 11 as follows.

**Construction C.5.** Let  $z : s \xrightarrow{r'_1} s'_1 \xrightarrow{r'_2} s'_2 \dots \xrightarrow{r'_m} s'_m$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  be a sequence satisfying the following constraints:

- M1.  $r'_1 \in L$  is a non-post transition and  $r'_1$  is the first transition in  $w$  from  $L$ . Let  $k = \text{index}(w, r'_1)$ .
- M2. For all  $r'_i$  in  $z$ ,  $i \neq 1$ ,  $r'_i$  is a transition in  $w$  and for all transitions  $r_j$  in  $w$  such that  $r'_i$  is dependent with  $r_j$ , if  $j < \text{index}(w, r'_i)$  then  $\text{index}(z, r_j) < i$ .
- M3.  $\exists r \in \text{nextTrans}(s'_m)$  such that  $r = r_\infty$  is in  $w$  where  $1 \leq \infty < k$ ,  $r'_1$  and  $r$  are dependent, and  $s'_m$  is the first state reached by  $z$  where  $r'_1$  has dependence with some transition in  $\alpha : r_1.r_2 \dots r_{k-1}$ , a prefix of  $w$ .

Construction C.5 differs from Construction C.3 in constraints M1 and M3. Following properties can be inferred for Construction C.5.

- P1. All the transitions in  $z$  are in  $w$ .
- P2. Transitions  $r'_1$  and  $r$  may be co-enabled i.e.,  $\text{thread}(r'_1) \neq \text{thread}(r)$ . This is because,  $r'_1 = \text{next}(q, \text{thread}(r'_1))$  at any state  $q$  visited by a prefix of sequence  $\alpha$ , including the state  $s_{\infty-1}$  where  $r = r_\infty$  is executed. Since both  $r'_1$  and  $r$  are in  $\text{nextTrans}(s_{\infty-1})$ ,  $\text{thread}(r'_1) \neq \text{thread}(r)$ .
- P3. A sequence  $z$  satisfying M1, M2 and M3 exists only if  $\exists r'_1 \in L$  such that  $r'_1$  is dependent with some transition prior to its index in  $w$ . In such a case  $z$  can at least consist of  $r'_1$  if  $r'_1$  is dependent with some transition in  $\text{nextTrans}(s)$  which is executed prior to  $r'_1$  in  $w$ . If  $r'_1$  is not dependent with any transition prior to it in  $w$ , then  $z$  does not exist. Nevertheless, as will be shown in Lemma C.6, we get a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  from  $s$  in  $\mathcal{S}_R$  without constructing  $z$  in such a case.
- P4.  $z$  is not a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  at state  $s$  as the dependence between  $r'_1$  and  $r$  does not satisfy any constraints of a dependence-covering sequence (Definition 2.4).

**Lemma C.6.** EM-DPOR explores a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  from state  $s$  when set  $L$  satisfies case C.

*Proof.* In the context of case C two sub-cases are possible:

I. Assume there exists a transition  $r'_1 \in L$  executed in  $w$  such that  $k = \text{index}(w, r'_1)$  and  $r'_1$  is independent with all the transitions  $r_i$  in  $w$  for  $1 \leq i < k$ . Then by Definition 2.2 transition  $r'_1$  commutes with all such  $r_i$  and thus  $r_{k-1}(\dots r_2(r_1(r'_1(s)))) = s_k$ . Since  $r_{k+1} \dots r_{n-1}r_n$  is enabled at  $s_k$ , sequence  $r'_1r_1 \dots r_{k-1}r_{k+1} \dots r_n$  is a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  from state  $s$ .

II. Assume no transition in  $L$  executed in  $w$  satisfies sub-case I. Let  $r'_1$  be the first transition in  $w$  from  $L$ , and let  $r'_1$  be dependent with some transition  $r_i$  in  $w$  where  $1 \leq i < k$  where  $k = \text{index}(w, r'_1)$ . Consider a sequence  $z$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  constructed by Construction C.5. Sequence  $z$  exists as sub-case II satisfies the precondition of property P3 of Construction C.5. As explained in Section C.1.2, let  $Z = z.z'.r$  or  $Z = z$  based on the existence of shortest  $z'$  that enables  $r$ . EM-DPOR explores a dependence-covering sequence  $u$  for  $v = r'_2.r'_3 \dots r'_m.z'.r$  or  $v = r'_2.r'_3 \dots r'_m$ , making  $r'_1.u$  a dependence-covering sequence of  $Z$ . Note that here  $r'_1 = r'_1$ . From Section C.1,  $\delta_\gamma \in \mathcal{S}_R$  is the state reached by  $S.r'_1.\gamma$  where  $\gamma$  is a prefix of  $u$  such that  $r \in \text{nextTrans}(\delta_\gamma)$ .

By Construction C.5 and its properties, transition  $r'_1$  is the nearest dependent and may be co-enabled transition with no happens-before with  $r$  at state  $\delta_\gamma$ . Then,  $\text{Explore}(S.r'_1.\gamma)$  invokes  $\text{FindTarget}(S.r'_1.\gamma, r'_1, r)$ . Line 3 in  $\text{FindTarget}$  is skipped as  $\text{thread}(r'_1) \neq \text{thread}(r)$ . Step 2 of  $\text{FindTarget}$  identifies state  $s$  from where  $r'_1$  is executed, as the state to add backtracking choices to reorder  $r'_1$  and  $r$ . We show that lines 4 and 6 compute  $\text{candidates} \subseteq \{\text{task}(r_1), \text{task}(r_2) \dots \text{task}(r_{k-1})\}$  i.e.,  $\text{candidates}$  has no task  $(t, e)$  such that transition  $\text{next}(s, t)$  is in  $\gamma \setminus \alpha$ . The reason for this is similar to a corresponding step in the proof of Lemma C.4. Set  $\text{candidates}$  only consists of those tasks whose threads are enabled at state  $s$ , and in this case only those tasks whose enabled transition at  $s$  are in  $\alpha : r_1.r_2 \dots r_{k-1}$ , a prefix of  $w$ . Now there are two cases.

1.  $\text{candidates} \neq \emptyset$  Then  $\text{threadSet}(\text{candidates}) \cap \text{backtrack}(s)$  is not an empty set. This is due to line 8 in Algorithm 2. This contradicts the assumption that  $r'_1$  is the first transition in  $w$  from  $L$ , as index of any transition in  $\alpha$  is lesser than  $k = \text{index}(w, r'_1)$ .

2.  $\text{candidates} = \emptyset$  Then set  $\text{pending}$  computed at line 9 in Algorithm 2 is also an empty set as  $\text{pending} \subseteq \text{candidates}$ . This results in a call to  $\text{BacktrackEager}(S.r'_1.\gamma, |S| + 1, r)$  on line 13 in Algorithm 2. Then, we can use a reasoning similar to that in the proof of Lemma C.4 to derive contradiction for the assumption that  $r'_1$  is the first transition in  $w$  from  $L$ .  $\square$

#### C.2.4 Case D

Case D states that  $L$  contains only *post* operations and no transition in  $L$  is in  $w$ . This case significantly differs from cases A, B and C, because unlike prior cases proving induction step for claim C1 in this case involves reasoning about the selective reordering of events by EM-DPOR. In particular, we consider the effect of Step 3 in Algorithm 2 (*FindTarget*) which reorders *post* operations with the help of *ReschedulePending* (Algorithm 3). We also need to consider the effect of *future* sets defined below by Definition C.7, when proving the induction step. Note that proving Lemma C.4 and C.6 did not involve reasoning on control paths of *BacktrackEager* those returned via line 8 in Algorithm 4. However, proof of Lemmas C.12 and C.14 for cases D and E respectively, considers all the control paths in Algorithm 4 (*BacktrackEager*). Thus, proofs for induction step related to cases B, C, D and E together reason about all the aspects of the four algorithms presented in the paper.

**Definition C.7.** A set *future* of a *post* operation  $r$  i.e.,  $\text{future}(r)$  is a set of transitions such that a transition  $r' \in \text{future}(r)$  if, (1) there exists a sequence  $w$  in  $S_G$  such that  $r'$  is executed by the handler of the event posted by  $r$  in  $w$ , or (2)  $r' \in \text{future}(r'')$  such that  $r''$  is a *post* operation and  $r'' \in \text{future}(r)$ .

We define the notion of *must-be-executed* transitions, which is used in the proofs ahead.

**Definition C.8.** A transition  $r$  *must-be-executed* in order to enable a transition  $r'$  blocked in a state  $s$  reached by a transition sequence  $w$  if,

1.  $r$  and  $r'$  are dependent such that  $r$  enables  $r'$  in an extension to  $w$ , or
2.  $r = \text{next}(s, t)$  on some thread  $t$  such that there exists a transition  $p$  in a task  $(t, e)$  where  $e \in \text{blockedEv}(s, t)$  and  $p$  *must-be-executed* to enable  $r'$ .
3. There exists a transition  $p$  such that  $p$  *must-be-executed* to enable  $r'$  and  $r$  *must-be-executed* to enable  $p$ .

To suit the case under consideration, we refine the construction of sequence  $z$  depicted in Figure 11 as follows.

**Construction C.9.** Let  $z : s \xrightarrow{r'_1} s'_1 \xrightarrow{r'_2} s'_2 \dots \xrightarrow{r'_m} s'_m$  in  $S_G$  be a sequence satisfying the following constraints:

- M1.  $r'_1 \in L$  is a *post* operation.
- M2. Each  $r'_i$ ,  $i \neq 1$ , enabled at state  $s'_{i-1}$  has been added to sequence  $z$  in the following order of preference:
  - (a)  $r'_i$  is a transition in  $w$  such that for each transition  $r_j$  in  $w$  where  $j < \text{index}(w, r'_i)$  and  $r'_i$  is dependent with  $r_j$ , transition  $r_j$  is already in  $w$  i.e.,  $\text{index}(z, r_j) < i$ .
  - (b) No transition in  $w$  enabled at  $s'_{i-1}$  satisfies the constraints of M2(a), and  $r'_i$  is a transition in  $\text{future}(r'_1)$  such that  $(t, e) = \text{task}(r'_i)$  and, there exists a transition  $r_j$  from  $w$  which satisfies all the constraints of M2(a) such that  $(t, e') = \text{task}(r_j)$  and  $e' \in \text{blockedEv}(s'_{i-1}, t)$ . In simple words,  $r'_i$  is executed in order to eventually execute a transition satisfying M2(a) whose handler is blocked in state  $s'_{i-1}$  on  $r'_i$ 's thread.
  - (c) Constraints of neither M2(a) nor M2(b) are satisfied by any transition enabled at  $s'_{i-1}$ , and  $r'_i$  is a transition that *must-*

*be-executed* to enable a transition  $p$  in  $\text{future}(r'_1)$  such that  $p$  is blocked in state  $s'_{i-1}$  and  $p$  satisfies all the constraints of M2(b).

- M3.  $s'_m$  is the first state reached by  $z$  such that  $r'_l$  is a transition in  $z$  where  $l = \max(\{\ell \in \text{dom}(z) \mid r'_\ell \text{ satisfies either condition M3(a) or M3(b)}\})$  and  $r'_l$  is dependent with some transition  $r = r_\varpi$  in  $w$  such that  $r \in \text{nextTrans}(s'_m)$ . Conditions M3(a) and M3(b) are defined as follows:
  - (a)  $r'_\ell$  is a transition added by condition M2(b).
  - (b)  $r'_\ell$  is a transition added by condition M2(c).

Following properties can be inferred for Construction C.9.

- P1. Each  $r'_i$  in  $z$ , for  $i \neq 1$ , is (a) a transition in  $w$ , or (b) a transition in  $\text{future}(r'_1)$ , or (c) a transition that *must-be-executed* to enable a transition in  $\text{future}(r'_1)$ .
- P2. Transitions  $r'_l$  and  $r$  may or may not be on the same thread. Even if they are on the same thread they are executed in different event handlers. This is because  $r$  is executed in  $w$  even prior to the *post* operation in  $r'_1$  is executed, and  $r'_l$  is either in the *future* of  $r'_1$  or  $r'_l$  is executed to enable some transition in the *future*( $r'_1$ ) — in which case  $r'_l$  could not be executed prior to  $r$  in  $z$  if both were in the same handler.
- P3. A sequence  $z$  satisfying M1, M2 and M3 exists as we have assumed that  $w$  has no dependence-covering sequence starting with any transition in  $L$  from state  $s$  (see Section C.1). This assumption holds only if  $z$  satisfies M3, otherwise by following the construction described in M2 we will get a dependence-covering sequence for  $w$  even though  $r'_1 \in L$ . We therefore consider the more interesting case where M3 holds.
- P4.  $z$  is not a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  at state  $s$  as the dependence between  $r'_l$  and  $r$  does not satisfy any constraints of a dependence-covering sequence (Definition 2.4).

When  $L$  satisfies case D along with the assumption that there exists no dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  from  $s$  in  $S_R$ , we can construct a sequence  $z$  using Construction C.9 such that  $z$  satisfies either of the two conditions below.

- S1.  $r'_l$  identified in condition M3 satisfies condition M3(a).
- S2.  $r'_l$  identified in condition M3 satisfies condition M3(b).

We prove the induction step for case D with the help of Lemma C.10 and Lemma C.11 corresponding to S1 and S2 respectively.

**Lemma C.10.** When sequence  $z$  constructed using Construction C.9 satisfies S1, set  $L$  contains a transition from sequence  $w$ .

*Proof.* Consider a sequence  $z$  in  $S_G$  constructed using Construction C.9. Let  $z$  satisfy condition S1. As explained in Section C.1.2, let  $Z = z.z'.r$  or  $Z = z$  based on the existence of shortest  $z'$  that enables  $r$ . Then, EM-DPOR explores a dependence-covering sequence  $u$  for  $v = r'_2.r'_3 \dots r'_m.z'.r$  or  $v = r'_2.r'_3 \dots r'_m$ , making  $r'_1.u$  a dependence-covering sequence of  $Z$ . Clearly,  $r'_1.u$  is not a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  (due to P4). From Section C.1,  $\delta_\gamma \in S_R$  is the state reached by  $S.r'_1.\gamma$  where  $\gamma$  is a prefix of  $u$  such that  $r'_l$  is a transition in  $r'_1.\gamma$  and  $r \in \text{nextTrans}(\delta_\gamma)$ .

Let  $\beta = S.r'_1.\gamma$ . By Construction C.9 and its properties, transition  $r'_l$  is the nearest dependent and may be co-enabled or may be reordered transition with no happens-before with  $r$  at state  $\delta_\gamma$ . Then, *Explore*( $\beta$ ) invokes *FindTarget*( $\beta, r'_l, r$ ).

We proceed by induction on the length of *postChain* (see Section 2.1) of a transition in  $\text{future}(r'_1)$ .

**Claim C2.** If EM-DPOR invokes  $\text{FindTarget}(S.r'_1.\xi, p, q)$  either from Algorithm 1 or recursively such that,  $\xi$  is a transition sequence explored from state  $s'_1$ ,  $q$  is a transition in  $w$  and  $p$  is a transition in  $\text{future}(r'_1)$  such that  $\text{postChain}(p, r'_1.\xi) = p_\eta.p_{\eta-1} \dots p_1$  where  $p_\eta = r'_1$ , then some transition in  $w$  is added to  $L$  as a backtracking choice before backtracking to a state prior to  $s$  in the stack  $S$ .

**Induction Hypothesis H2.** Claim C2 holds for  $\eta = \chi$ .

**Base case ( $\eta = 1$ ).** Let  $\text{postChain}(r'_1, r'_1.\gamma) = r'_1$ . We prove the claim C2 for  $r'_1$  and  $r$  being on the same thread or different threads as separate cases.

**$\text{thread}(r'_1) = \text{thread}(r)$**  Then, from property P2 corresponding to Construction C.9  $r'_1$  and  $r$  are transitions in different handlers on the same thread. Let  $t = \text{thread}(r'_1) = \text{thread}(r)$ . Let  $(t, e) = \text{task}(r)$  and let  $r'$  be a transition containing  $\text{post}(\_, e, t)$ . Let  $(t, e') = \text{task}(r'_1)$ . Figure 12 shows a projection of  $\beta$  on thread  $t$  only for a subsequence of transitions of interest. All transitions in the figure except  $r$  are already executed in  $\beta$ . The indices of the executed transitions in the sequence depicted in the figure increases from top to bottom of the figure. Each of the rectangular boxes in the figure represents an event handler. The event corresponding to the handler is annotated against each of the boxes. All the transitions or handlers executed on a thread are drawn vertically below their respective thread names. A solid edge between the boxes represents a happens-before relation between a pair of transitions in the two boxes. This convention will be followed in all similar figures here onwards.




Figure 12:  $r$  and  $r'_1$  on the same thread

On calling  $\text{FindTarget}(\beta, r'_1, r)$ , since  $\text{thread}(r'_1) = \text{thread}(r)$ , line 3 in Algorithm 2 recursively invokes  $\text{FindTarget}(\beta, r'_1, r')$  attempting to reorder corresponding  $\text{post}$  operations of tasks of  $r'_1$  and  $r$ . Transition  $r'$  is in  $w$ . This is because  $S.w$  and  $S.r'_1.u$  share the common prefix  $S$ . However, among events  $e$  and  $e'$  only  $e$  is posted in  $S.w$ , whereas  $e'$  is posted prior to  $e$  in  $S.r'_1.u$ . In a FIFO based event-driven system this could happen only if the transition  $r'$  posting  $e$  is in  $w$ . Let  $\iota = \text{index}(w, r')$ . Note that  $\text{thread}(r'_1) \neq \text{thread}(r')$ , as  $r'_1 = \text{next}(q, \text{thread}(r'_1))$  at all states  $q$  visited by  $w$  including  $q = s_{\iota-1}$  where  $r'$  is executed in  $w$ . Hence,  $\text{FindTarget}(\beta, r'_1, r')$  skips line 3. Step 2 of  $\text{FindTarget}$  identifies state  $s$  from where  $r'_1$  is executed, as the state to add backtracking choices to reorder  $r'_1$  and  $r'$ . We show that lines 5 and 6 compute set  $\text{candidates} \subseteq \{\text{task}(r_1), \text{task}(r_2) \dots \text{task}(r_{\iota-1})\}$  i.e.,  $\text{candidates}$  only has those tasks whose  $\text{next}$  transition at state  $s$  are transitions in a prefix of  $w$ . This is because by construction, relative order of dependent transitions in  $w$  are maintained in  $v$  which is a suffix of sequence  $z$  excluding transition  $r'_1$ . Also, any transition  $p_1$  in  $v$  belonging to  $w$  is not dependent with a transition  $p_2$  in  $v$  which is not in  $w$  and executed prior to  $p_1$ . Sequence  $\gamma$  is a prefix of sequence  $u$  which is a dependence-covering sequence of  $v$  and  $\beta = S.r'_1.\gamma$ . Hence, there exists no transition  $p$  in  $\gamma \setminus w$  such that  $p$  happens-before  $r'$  in  $\beta$ .

If  $\text{candidates} \neq \emptyset$  then  $\text{threadSet}(\text{candidates}) \cap \text{backtrack}(s) \neq \emptyset$ . Hence, we have proved that set  $L$  con-




Figure 13:  $r$  and  $r'_1$  on different threads

tains a transition from  $w$ , as  $\text{candidates}$  only consists of tasks whose enabled transitions at state  $s$  are executed in  $w$ . However, if  $\text{candidates} = \emptyset$  then set  $\text{pending}$  computed at line 9 of Algorithm 2 is an empty set as  $\text{pending} \subseteq \text{candidates}$ . This results in a call to  $\text{BacktrackEager}(\beta, |S| + 1, r')$  on line 13. Then, we can use a similar reasoning as in the proof of Lemma C.4 to show that set  $L$  contains a transition from  $w$ .

**$\text{thread}(r'_1) \neq \text{thread}(r)$**  As per the precedence rules in condition M2,  $r'_1 \in \text{future}(r'_1)$  is executed before  $r$  only if  $r$  or some transition  $r'_k$  prior to  $r$  on  $\text{thread}(r)$  is dependent on some transition  $r'_j$  on  $\text{thread}(r'_1)$  such that  $r'_k$  can be executed only after  $r'_j$ . This can happen if  $r'_j$  and  $r'_k$  are dependent transitions from  $w$  such that  $\text{index}(w, r'_j) < \text{index}(w, r'_k)$ , or  $r'_j$  is a transition in  $w$  and  $r'_k \in \text{future}(r'_1)$  and  $r'_j$  is executed prior to  $r'_k$  in order to respect condition M2(a). In the former case,  $\text{task}(r'_k)$  may or may not be same as  $\text{task}(r)$  and  $r'_k$  may or may not have happens-before relation with  $r$ ; whereas in the latter case clearly  $\text{task}(r'_k) \neq \text{task}(r)$  and there exists no happens-before relation between  $r'_k$  and  $r$ . In both the cases  $\text{task}(r'_1) \neq \text{task}(r'_j)$ . Figure 13 shows a projection of  $\beta$  on thread  $t$  and  $t'$  executing  $r$  and  $r'_1$  respectively, only for a subsequence of transitions of interest. The challenge in obtaining a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  in this case, is to reorder  $r'_1$  and  $r$  while preserving the relative order of  $r'_j$  and  $r'_k$ .

Figure 14 depicts a generalization for the scenario described above when  $\text{thread}(r'_1) \neq \text{thread}(r)$  in sequence  $\beta$ . In general  $\text{thread}(r'_1) \neq \text{thread}(r)$  is possible in  $\beta$  only if there exists a set  $E$  such that,

$$\begin{aligned} E = & \{((r_j)'_a, (r_k)'_a), 1 \leq a \leq \tau \mid \text{thread}((r_j)'_a) \neq \text{thread}((r_k)'_a) \\ & \bigwedge \text{index}(\beta, (r_j)'_a) \rightarrow_\beta \text{index}(\beta, (r_k)'_a) \\ & \bigwedge (\text{for } 1 \leq a < \tau, \text{thread}((r_k)'_a) = \text{thread}((r_j)'_{a+1}) \\ & \quad \wedge \text{event}((r_k)'_a) \neq \text{event}((r_j)'_{a+1}))\} \\ & \bigcup \{(r'_1, r) \mid \text{thread}(r'_1) = \text{thread}((r_j)'_1) \wedge \text{thread}((r_k)'_\tau) \\ & \quad = \text{thread}(r) \wedge \text{event}(r'_1) \neq \text{event}((r_j)'_1)\} \end{aligned}$$

where  $(r_j)'_a$  for  $1 \leq a \leq \tau$  is a transition from  $w$  and  $(r_k)'_a$ ,  $1 \leq a \leq \tau$ , is a transition either from  $w$  or from  $\text{future}(r'_1)$  as described for the scenario in Figure 13. Thus, transitions depicted in Figure 14 are present in sequence  $v$  too, maintaining the same dependence structure as shown in the figure. To derive a dependence-covering sequence for  $w$ , EM-DPOR must be able to reorder  $r'_1$  and  $r$  while maintaining the relative execution order of all the other pair of dependent transitions in  $E$ .

In Figure 14 we have omitted the edge from  $r'_1$  to  $r$  for readability, even though they are dependent. Figure 15 represents a partial




Figure 14: General structure for projection of transitions of interest in  $\beta$  (or  $v$ ) when  $\text{thread}(r) \neq \text{thread}(r'_l)$




Figure 15: Partial state space of suffix of  $v$  rooted at state  $s'_{l-1}$ . Sequences  $v$ ,  $v_1$  and  $v_{\tau}$  are rooted at state  $s'_1$ .

state space of interleavings of transitions in a suffix of sequence  $v$  corresponding to Figure 14, starting from state  $s'_{l-1}$ . Note that  $r'_l$  is executed from  $s'_{l-1}$  in  $v$ . In Figure 15 a solid circle with no annotation denotes a state in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ . A black colored dashed edge between two states denotes a transition sequence connecting the two states, and the transition (or sequence) annotated against such an edge is a suffix of this sequence. We refer to each distinct transition sequence from state  $s'_1$  in the figure, using a label written after the last state in each sequence. Note that we assume each of the states in Figure 15 to be distinct as each of these sequences has altered the order of a pair of dependent transitions compared to other sequences.

Let state  $s' = \text{pre}(\beta, \text{index}(\beta, r'_l))$ . When algorithm **Explore** invokes **FindTarget**( $\beta, r'_l, r$ ) on  $\beta$  with a partial structure as depicted for the general case, line 3 in Algorithm 2 is skipped as




Figure 16: Projection of key dependent transitions in sequence  $v_{\tau}$

$\text{thread}(r'_l) \neq \text{thread}(r)$ . Step 2 of **FindTarget** identifies state  $s'$  from where  $r'_l$  is executed, as the state to add backtracking choices to reorder  $r'_l$  and  $r$ . Lines 4 and 6 compute *candidates* in order to explore  $r$  before  $r'_l$ . Now there are two cases.

1. *candidates*  $\neq \emptyset$  If **threadSet(candidates)**  $\not\subseteq \text{done}(s')$  then, a thread corresponding to a task in *candidates* containing a transition that has happens-before with  $r$  such that the thread is not already in  $\text{done}(s')$  is added to  $\text{backtrack}(s')$  by line 8 in Algorithm 2. If  $\text{thread}(r)$  is enabled at  $s'$  and not in  $\text{done}(s')$ , then by induction hypothesis H1 the algorithm eventually explores a dependence-covering sequence  $u_1$  from state  $s'_1$  for a sequence  $v_1$  (see Figure 15). This explores a run where  $r$  is scheduled before  $r'_l$ , but in the process reverses happens-before mapping between  $(r_j)'_{\tau}$  and  $(r_k)'_{\tau}$ . Then, **Explore** invokes **FindTarget** (line 3 in Algorithm 1) to reorder  $(r_k)'_{\tau}$  and  $(r_j)'_{\tau}$  and in the process may reverse happens-before mapping of  $(r_j)'_{\tau-1}$  and  $(r_k)'_{\tau-1}$ , and so on. In general, EM-DPOR explores a sequence where the order of executing  $(r_j)'_a$  and  $(r_k)'_a$  is reversed with respect to that given in sequence  $v$ , for some  $a \in [1, \tau]$ . Sequence  $v_{\tau}$  in Figure 15 represents such a scenario where the happens-before mapping of a pair  $(r_j)'_a$  and  $(r_k)'_a$ , for  $a \in [1, \tau]$ , is reversed while the rest are maintained. Figure 16 shows a projection of transitions  $r$ ,  $r'_l$ ,  $(r_j)'_a$  and  $(r_k)'_a$  for  $1 \leq a \leq \tau$  in sequence  $v_{\tau}$  on their respective threads. EM-DPOR explores  $u_{\tau}$ , a dependence-covering sequence of  $v_{\tau}$  from  $s'_1$ . Unfortunately, such a sequence cannot be a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$ . This is because it has reversed a happens-before mapping present in  $w$  or has resulted in a new happens-before mapping into a transition  $(r_j)'_a$  in  $w$ , depending on if  $(r_k)'_a$  is in  $w$  or not respectively.

Let  $\delta_{\mu} \in \mathcal{S}_R$  be the state reached by  $S.r'_l.\mu$  where  $\mu$  is a prefix of  $u_{\tau}$  such that transition  $(r_j)'_a$  is in  $\text{nextTrans}(\delta_{\mu})$ . Then, **Explore**( $S.r'_l.\mu$ ) invokes **FindTarget**( $S.r'_l.\mu, (r_k)'_a, (r_j)'_a$ ) since  $(r_k)'_a$  and  $(r_j)'_a$  are dependent, may be co-enabled with no happens-before mapping between them. **FindTarget** computes set *candidates*<sub>1</sub> to compute backtracking choices to reorder  $(r_k)'_a$  and  $(r_j)'_a$ . Let  $s'' = \text{pre}(\beta, (r_k)'_a)$ . Without loss of generality, assume *candidates*<sub>1</sub>  $\subseteq \text{done}(s'')$ . Note that this control path is reached for some pair of dependent transitions  $((r_k)'_a, (r_j)'_a)$ ,  $1 \leq a \leq \tau$ , and happens eventually after the algorithm runs out of all the backtracking options in *candidates*<sub>1</sub> to reorder  $(r_k)'_a$  and  $(r_j)'_a$ . Since these deviations do not affect the crux of the proof we do not elaborate on them. Then, line 9 computes *pending*<sub>1</sub>, a subset of *candidates*<sub>1</sub>. Clearly, *pending*<sub>1</sub> is not an empty set as at least task  $(t_{a-1}, (e_j)_a) \in \text{candidates}_1$  whose event is blocked




Figure 17: Projections of some key interleavings of  $v$  when condition M3(b) is satisfied

in state  $s''$  is added to  $pending_1$ . Set  $pending_1$  not being empty results in a call to `ReschedulePending` (Algorithm 3) on line 10 in Algorithm 2. Without loss of generality we assume line 2 in Algorithm 3 picks task  $(t_{a-1}, (e_j)_a)$  from  $pending_1$  and adds  $(e_j)_a$  to set  $swapMap[t_{a-1}]$  and adds  $(t_{a-1}, (e_k)_{a-1})$ , the executable task at state  $s''$  on  $t_{a-1}$ 's queue, to  $worklist$ . Even if the algorithm picks some other blocked task on some thread  $t''$  in  $pending_1$ , it only reduces the number of blocked tasks with transitions having happens-before with  $(r_j)'_a$  on  $t''$ 's event queue when EM-DPOR explores a sequence similar to  $u_\tau$ . Hence, eventually  $(e_j)_a$  is added to set  $swapMap[t_{a-1}]$ . Line 5 adds  $(t_{a-2}, (e_j)_{a-1})$  to set  $C$  as transition  $(r_j)'_{a-1}$  in the handler of  $(e_j)_{a-1}$  has happens-before relation with  $(r_k)'_{a-1}$  whose task is in  $worklist$ , and  $index(S.r'_1.\mu, r'_1) \rightsquigarrow_{S.r'_1.\mu} index(S.r'_1.\mu, (r_k)'_{a-2})$ . Then, line 7 adds  $(e_j)_{a-1}$  to  $swapMap[t_{a-2}]$ , and so on. Thus, lines 3–9 in Algorithm 3 add events  $(e_j)_1$ ,  $e$  and  $(e_j)_a$  for  $1 \leq a \leq \tau$  to  $swapMap$  for their respective threads.

Lines 10–14 iterate on each set of pending events in  $swapMap$  and eventually pick event  $(e_j)_1$  in order to swap the transition posting  $(e_j)_1$  with  $r'_1$  which posts  $e'$  — the executable event at  $s''$  on  $t'$ 's queue. Then, line 13 in Algorithm 3 calls `FindTarget` ( $S.r'_1.\mu, r'_1, getPost(S.r'_1.\mu, (e_j)_1)$ ). The transition  $getPost(S.r'_1.\mu, (e_j)_1)$  is in  $w$ . This is because if  $(e_j)_1$ 's post is in  $S$  — a common prefix of  $S.w$  and  $S.r'_1.\mu$ , then  $(e_j)_1$ 's handler should have executed before  $e'$ 's handler even in  $S.r'_1.\mu$  due to FIFO execution. `FindTarget` invoked to reorder  $r'_1$  and the transition posting  $(e_j)_1$  adds a transition from  $w$  to set  $L$  due to reasons similar to the case where  $thread(r'_1) = thread(r)$ .

Now consider the case where  $threadSet(candidates) \subseteq done(s')$  when  $candidates \neq \emptyset$ . Then, line 9 which computes  $pending$  set is reached. Due to reasons similar to the ones presented in the previous paragraph, Algorithm 2 invokes `ReschedulePending` which identifies post operations corresponding to events  $e' - (e_j)_1$ ,  $(e_k)_a - (e_j)_{a+1}$  for  $1 \leq a \leq \tau - 1$ , and  $(e_k)_\tau - e$ , for reordering. Then `FindTarget` called recursively to reorder  $r'_1$  posting event  $e'$  and the transition posting  $(e_j)_1$ , adds a transition in  $w$  to set  $L$  as proved earlier.

2.  $candidates = \emptyset$  Then set  $pending$  computed at line 9 in Algorithm 2 is an empty set as  $pending \subseteq candidates$ . This results in a call to `BacktrackEager` ( $S.r'_1.\gamma, index(\beta, r'_1), r$ ) on line 13. `BacktrackEager` identifies all the pairs of co-enabled transitions having index from 1 to  $index(\beta, r'_1) - 1$  and posting events to the same thread. It computes backtracking choices on lines 5–6 in Algorithm 4 to reorder such post operations. Transition  $r'_1$  posts an event  $e'$  to thread  $t'$  and clearly  $index(\beta, r'_1) < index(\beta, r'_1)$ . In  $S.r'_1.u$  which is a dependence-covering sequence of  $S.r'_1.v$ , by construction a transition in  $w$ , say  $r_i$ , posts an event to thread  $t'$  before  $e'$  is dequeued (condition M2(b)). Condition M2(c) adds transitions to  $v$  only to enable transitions in  $future(r'_1)$ , and thus no transition gets added due to this condition till atleast  $e'$  posted

by  $r'_1$  gets dequeued. Thus  $index(\beta, r_i) < index(\beta, r'_1)$  and  $r_i$  is the nearest co-enabled transition to  $r'_1$  posting event to  $t'$ . Also, new happens-before mappings added due to FIFO between handlers of post operations ordered by `BacktrackEager` do not order  $r'_1$  and  $r_i$ , as they are nearest co-enabled posts and  $r_i$  is executed even before event posted by  $r'_1$  is dequeued. Hence, `BacktrackEager` computes backtracking choices at state  $s$  ( $r'_1$  is executed at  $s$  in  $\beta$ ) to reorder  $r'_1$  and  $r_i$  on line 5 in Algorithm 4, and as demonstrated in earlier instances this results in a transition from  $w$  to be added to  $L$ . Thus assumptions made in case D is contradicted.

Thus induction statement holds for the base case ( $\eta = 1$ ).

**Induction Step** ( $\eta = \chi + 1$ ). Then,  $postChain(r'_1, r'_1.u) = p_{\chi+1}.p_\chi \dots p_1$ , where  $r'_1 = p_{\chi+1}$ . Let  $(t, e) = task(r)$  and  $(t', e') = task(r'_1)$ . Then,  $p_1 = getPost(e')$ . Similar to the base case, we consider the scenarios where  $r'_1$  and  $r$  are on the same thread or different threads separately.

**$thread(r'_1) = thread(r)$**  Let  $r' = getPost(e)$ . Transition  $r'$  is in  $w$ , otherwise event  $e$  posted by  $r'$  would be dequeued before  $e'$  posted by  $p_1$  even in  $\beta$  due to FIFO. Since  $thread(r'_1) = thread(r)$ , line 3 of `FindTarget` ( $\beta, r'_1, r$ ) invokes `FindTarget` ( $\beta, p_1, r'$ ). Clearly, transition  $p_1$  in  $future(r'_1)$  has a  $postChain$  length of  $\chi$  and  $r'$  is in  $w$ . Then, by applying induction hypothesis H2 to `FindTarget` ( $\beta, p_1, r'$ ), we can conclude that a transition in  $w$  is added to  $L$  before backtracking to a state prior to  $s$  in the stack.

**$thread(r) \neq thread(r'_1)$**  Let  $\beta$  explored by the algorithm, have a generalized dependence structure for the case  $thread(r) \neq thread(r'_1)$  as given in Figure 14 with  $\tau \geq 1$ . As reasoned in the base case, backtracking choices added by the algorithm due to `FindTarget` ( $\beta, r'_1, r$ ) eventually explores a run where the order of executing  $(r_j)'_a$  and  $(r_k)'_a$  is reversed with respect to that given in Figure 14, for some  $a \in [1, \tau]$ , and as depicted for sequence  $v_\tau$  in Figure 15 and Figure 16. `FindTarget` invoked to reorder  $(r_k)'_a - (r_j)'_a$  computes backtracking points and choices via a call to `ReschedulePending`, and thus computes backtracking choices to reorder post operations corresponding to events  $e' - (e_j)_1$ ,  $(e_k)_a - (e_j)_{a+1}$  for  $1 \leq a \leq \tau - 1$ , and  $(e_k)_\tau - e$ . Such a run invokes `FindTarget` recursively to reorder  $p_1$  posting event  $e'$  and a transition posting event  $(e_j)_1$ ; transition  $p_1$  in  $future(r'_1)$  has a  $postChain$  length of  $\chi$ . By induction hypothesis H2 this eventually adds a transition in  $w$  to set  $L$ .

In the scenario where `BacktrackEager` is invoked to reorder  $r'_1 - r$  or  $(r_k)'_a - (r_j)'_a$ , a transition from  $w$  is added to set  $L$  as explained in the base case.

Thus induction statement holds for inductive case where  $\eta = \chi + 1$ . Hence, we have proved that a transition from  $w$  is in  $L$  when  $z$  satisfies S1.  $\square$

**Lemma C.11.** When sequence  $z$  constructed using Construction C.9 satisfies S2, set  $L$  contains a transition from sequence  $w$ .

*Proof.* Consider a sequence  $z$  in  $S_G$  constructed using Construction C.9 such that it satisfies condition S2. As explained in Section C.1.2, let  $Z = z.z'.r$  or  $Z = z$  based on the existence of shortest  $z'$  that enables  $r$ . Then, EM-DPOR explores a dependence-covering sequence  $u$  for  $v = r'_2.r'_3 \dots r'_m.z'.r$  or  $v = r'_2.r'_3 \dots r'_m$ , making  $r'_1.u$  a dependence-covering sequence of  $Z$ . Clearly,  $r'_1.u$  is not a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$ .

Since  $z$  satisfies S2, transition  $r'_1$  is added due to condition M2(c) in Construction C.9 and is dependent with a transition  $r$  from  $w$  such that  $r \in \text{nextTrans}(s'_m)$ . Transition  $r'_1$  *must-be-executed* in sequence  $v$  to enable some transition  $r'_\kappa \in \text{future}(r'_1)$  such that the event handler of  $r'_\kappa$  must be executed to execute an event handler on  $\text{thread}(r'_\kappa)$  whose transitions are in  $w$  (see condition M2(c)). Then,  $r$  may be a transition in a handler on  $\text{thread}(r'_\kappa)$  executed after  $\text{task}(r'_\kappa)$  (a projection of a sequence of this case is shown in Figure 17(a)), or  $r$  is a transition dependent directly or transitively with some transition  $r'_j$  from  $w$  and inside a handler in  $\text{thread}(r'_\kappa)$  executed after  $\text{task}(r'_\kappa)$  (see Figure 17(b)). In either case  $\text{thread}(r) \neq \text{thread}(r'_1)$ . While these represent a simplified nature of execution of  $r$ , real executions may have a generalized version along the lines of Figure 14. We give a proof sketch only for the simplified structure, as the general structure can be proved in a similar manner with some additional steps.

From Section C.1,  $\delta_\gamma \in S_R$  is the state reached by  $S.r'_1.\gamma$  where  $\gamma$  is a prefix of  $u$  such that  $r$  dependent with  $r'_1$  is in  $\text{nextTrans}(\delta_\gamma)$ . Let  $\beta = S.r'_1.\gamma$ . Then,  $\text{Explore}(\beta)$  invokes  $\text{FindTarget}(\beta, r'_1, r)$ , as  $r'_1$  and  $r$  are co-enabled and have no happens-before between them. Let  $s' = \text{pre}(\beta, \text{index}(\beta, r'_1))$ . Step 2 of  $\text{FindTarget}$  identifies state  $s'$  from where  $r'_1$  is executed, as the state to add backtracking choices to reorder  $r'_1$  and  $r$ .

Consider  $\text{thread}(r'_\kappa) = \text{thread}(r)$  i.e., scenario represented in Figure 17(a). Let  $(t, e) = \text{task}(r)$ . Now, even though  $r'_\kappa$  executed on thread  $t$  is in  $\text{nextTrans}(s')$ ,  $t \notin \text{enabled}(s')$ , as  $r'_1$  *must-be-executed* to enable  $r'_\kappa$  and per condition M2(c) which means  $r'_\kappa$  is blocked in  $s'$  (by Definition C.8). Thus, set *candidates* and set *pending* computed by  $\text{FindTarget}(\beta, r'_1, r)$  will be empty. Thus,  $\text{FindTarget}$  invokes  $\text{BacktrackEager}(\beta, \text{index}(\beta, r'_1), r)$ . Then  $\text{BacktrackEager}$  adds a transition from  $w$  to set  $L$ . The proof for this case is analogous to a similar scenario in the proof for the base case of induction when  $\text{thread}(r) \neq \text{thread}(r'_1)$  in Lemma C.10.

Now consider  $\text{thread}(r'_\kappa) \neq \text{thread}(r)$  i.e., scenario represented in Figure 17(b). Here transition  $r'_j$  is such that  $\text{index}(\beta, r'_j) \rightarrow_\beta \text{task}(r)$ . If  $r'_j$  enables  $r$  (directly or through some intermediate transition) then, neither  $\text{thread}(r'_j)$  nor  $\text{thread}(r)$  will be in  $\text{enabled}(s')$  thus eventually resulting in  $\text{BacktrackEager}(\beta, \text{index}(\beta, r'_1), r)$ . This adds a transition from  $w$  to set  $L$ .

Now let us assume  $r'_j$  does not enable  $r$  or any transition that happens-before  $r$ , but  $r'_j$  is executed before  $r$  in sequence  $v$  only to maintain the relative ordering of dependent transitions from  $w$  as per condition M2(a). In such a case  $\text{Explore}(\beta)$  computes backtracking choices which eventually results in exploring a run with a dependence structure as shown in Figure 17(c). For simplicity let us assume  $r$  is directly dependent with  $r'_j$ . Then, the relative ordering of dependent transitions  $r$  and  $r'_j$  has got reversed with respect to their ordering in Figure 17(b). Now,  $\text{FindTarget}$  invoked to reorder transitions  $r$  and  $r'_j$  invokes  $\text{BacktrackEager}$  as  $r'_1$  *must-be-executed* to enable  $r'_\kappa$  on  $\text{thread}(r'_j)$  and in a run corresponding to Figure 17(c)  $r'_1$  is executed after  $r$ . Thus  $\text{thread}(r'_j)$  is not en-

abled in a state prior to executing transition  $r$ . As explained for the case when  $\text{thread}(r'_\kappa) = \text{thread}(r)$ , call to  $\text{BacktrackEager}$  adds a transition from  $w$  to set  $L$ .

Thus, we have proved that a transition from sequence  $w$  is in set  $L$  when  $z$  satisfies S2.  $\square$

**Lemma C.12.** EM-DPOR explores a dependence-covering sequence for  $w$  from state  $s$  when set  $L$  satisfies case D.

*Proof.* When  $L$  satisfies case D such that there exists no dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  from  $s$  in  $S_R$ , we can construct a sequence  $z$  that satisfies either S1 or S2. However, by Lemma C.10 and Lemma C.11, if  $z$  satisfies either of S1 or S2 then there exists a transition in set  $L$  from sequence  $w$ . This contradicts the assumption made on the contents of  $L$  in case D and thus proves that EM-DPOR explores a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  from state  $s$ .  $\square$

### C.2.5 Case E

Case E states that the first transition in  $w$  from  $L$  is a post operation. In this case if  $L$  contains non-post transitions we assume all of them to be dependent with some transition in  $w$ . Note that the presence of non-post transition does not affect the proof. Similar to case D proof of induction step for this case involves reasoning about the selective reordering of events due to reordering of posts by EM-DPOR. To suit the case under consideration, we refine the construction of sequence  $z$  depicted in Figure 11 as follows.

**Construction C.13.** Let  $z : s \xrightarrow{r'_1} s'_1 \xrightarrow{r'_2} s'_2 \dots \xrightarrow{r'_m} s'_m$  in  $S_G$  be a sequence satisfying the following constraints:

- M1.  $r'_1 \in L$  is a post operation and  $r'_1$  is the first transition in  $w$  from  $L$ .
- M2. Each  $r'_i$ ,  $i \neq 1$ , enabled at state  $s'_{i-1}$  has been added to sequence  $z$  in the following order of preference:
  - (a)  $r'_i$  is a transition in  $w$  such that for each transition  $r_j$  in  $w$  where  $j < \text{index}(w, r'_i)$  and  $r'_i$  is dependent with  $r_j$ ,  $r'_i$  is added only if  $r_j$  is in  $z$  i.e.,  $\text{index}(z, r_j) < i$ .
  - (b) No transition in  $w$  enabled at  $s'_{i-1}$  satisfies the constraints of M2(a), and  $r'_i$  is a transition in  $\text{future}(r'_1)$  with  $(t, e) = \text{task}(r'_i)$  such that (i) there exists some transition  $r_j$  in  $w$  which satisfies all the constraints of M2(a) but  $r_j \notin \text{future}(r'_1)$ ,  $(t, e') = \text{task}(r_j)$  and  $e' \in \text{blockedEv}(s'_{i-1}, t)$ , and (ii) either  $r'_i$  is not a transition in  $w$ , or  $\text{index}(w, r_j) < \text{index}(w, r'_i)$ .
  - (c) Constraints of neither M2(a) nor M2(b) are satisfied by any transition enabled at  $s'_{i-1}$ , and  $r'_i$  is a transition that *must-be-executed* to enable some transition  $p$  in  $\text{future}(r'_1)$  such that  $p$  is blocked in state  $s'_{i-1}$  and  $p$  satisfies all the constraints of M2(b).
- M3.  $s'_m$  is the first state reached by  $z$  such that  $r'_l$  is a transition in  $z$  where  $l = \max(\{\ell \in \text{dom}(z) \mid r'_\ell \text{ satisfies either condition M3(a) or M3(b)}\})$  and  $r'_l$  is dependent with some transition  $r = r_\infty$  in  $w$  such that  $r \in \text{nextTrans}(s'_m)$ . Conditions M3(a) and M3(b) are defined as follows:
  - (a)  $r'_\ell$  is a transition added by condition M2(b) and either  $r'_\ell$  is not a transition in  $w$  or  $\text{index}(w, r) < \text{index}(w, r'_\ell)$ .
  - (b)  $r'_\ell$  is a transition added by condition M2(c).

Following properties can be inferred for Construction C.13.

- P1. Each  $r'_i$  in  $z$ , for  $i \neq 1$ , is (a) a transition in  $w$ , or (b) a transition in  $\text{future}(r'_1)$ , or (c) a transition that *must-be-executed* (see Definition C.8) to enable a transition in  $\text{future}(r'_1)$ .

- P2. Transition  $r'_i$  added by M2(a) may be a transition in  $future(r'_1)$  executed in  $w$ .
- P3. Transitions  $r'_i$  and  $r$  may or may not be on the same thread. Even if they are on the same thread they are executed in different event handlers. This is because if  $r$  and  $r'_i$  were in the same handler their order of execution would not change in different interleavings as we assume all transitions in the same handler to be totally ordered.
- P4. Same property as P3 of Construction C.9.
- P5.  $z$  is not a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  at state  $s$  as the dependence between  $r'_i$  and  $r$  does not satisfy any constraints of a dependence-covering sequence (Definition 2.4).

Note that Construction C.13 differs from Construction C.9 due to construction constraints M2(b), M3(a) and property P2.

**Lemma C.14.** EM-DPOR explores a dependence-covering sequence for  $w$  from state  $s$  when set  $L$  satisfies case E.

*Proof.* Consider a sequence  $z$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  constructed using Construction C.13. As explained in Section C.1.2, let  $Z = z.z'.r$  or  $Z = z$  based on the existence of shortest  $z'$  that enables  $r$ . Then, EM-DPOR explores a dependence-covering sequence  $u$  for  $v = r'_2.r'_3 \dots r'_m.z'.r$  or  $v = r'_2.r'_3 \dots r'_m$ , making  $r'_1.u$  a dependence-covering sequence of  $Z$ . From Section C.1,  $\delta_\gamma \in \mathcal{S}_R$  is the state reached by  $S.r'_1.\gamma$  where  $\gamma$  is a prefix of  $u$  such that  $r \in nextTrans(\delta_\gamma)$ .

Similar to case D, sequence  $z$  satisfies M3(a) or M3(b) of Construction C.13 if  $w$  has no dependence-covering sequence in  $\mathcal{S}_R$  from state  $s$ . If  $z$  satisfies M3(a), we proceed by induction on the length of  $postChain$  (see Section 2.1) of a transition in  $future(r'_1)$ .

**Claim C3.** If the algorithm EM-DPOR invokes  $FindTarget(S.r'_1.\xi, p, q)$  either from Algorithm 1 or recursively such that,  $\xi$  is a transition sequence explored from state  $s'_1$ ,  $q$  is a transition in  $w$  and  $p$  is a transition in  $future(r'_1)$  such that  $postChain(p, r'_1.\xi) = p_\eta.p_{\eta-1} \dots p_1$  where  $p_\eta = r'_1$ , and either  $p$  is not in  $w$  or  $index(w, q) < index(w, p)$  then, some transition in  $w$  with an index lesser than  $index(w, r'_1)$  is added to  $L$  as a backtracking choice before backtracking to a state prior to  $s$  in the stack  $S$ .

**Induction Hypothesis H3.** Claim C3 holds when  $\eta = \chi$ .

The proof of the base case ( $\eta = 1$ ) and induction step ( $\eta = \chi + 1$ ) is similar to the induction based proof of Claim C2 in Lemma C.10. This proof will establish a contradiction to the assumption that  $r'_1$  is the first transition in  $w$  from set  $L$ .

If  $z$  satisfies M3(b), then we can show that some transition in  $w$  with index lesser than that of  $index(w, r'_1)$  is in  $L$ . The proof for this case is similar to the proof of Lemma C.11.

We omit the proofs for both these cases to avoid repetition. These two cases establish the existence of a dependence-covering sequence of  $w$  in  $\mathcal{S}_R$  from state  $s$ .  $\square$

### C.3 Main Result

**Theorem 3.7.** In a finite and acyclic state space  $\mathcal{S}_G$ , whenever Explore (Algorithm 1) backtracks from a state  $s$  to a state prior to  $s$  in the search stack, EM-DPOR has explored a dependence-covering sequence for any sequence  $w$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  from  $s$  i.e., the set of transitions explored from a state  $s$  is a dependence-covering set in  $s$ .

*Proof.* The proof for this theorem is by induction on the order in which states visited by EM-DPOR are backtracked (Induction hypothesis H1), as explained in the proof strategy in Section C.1.

**Base case.** The first backtracked state is a state with no transitions enabled. Such a state is reached as Algorithm Explore performs a depth first search on the state space of  $\mathcal{S}_G$  which is finite and acyclic. The induction hypothesis H1 vacuously holds for such a state with no outgoing transitions.

**Induction Step.** Lemmas C.2, C.4, C.6, C.12 and C.14 prove the induction step for all the cases on contents of  $L$  introduced in Section C.1.

Thus EM-DPOR explores a dependence-covering sequence for any sequence  $w$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$  from a state  $s$  reached on Explore( $S$ ), which in turn establishes that the set of transitions  $L$  explored from  $s$  is a dependence-covering set.  $\square$